

ARCHILOCHUS, TELEPHUS, AND THE WARRIOR ETHOS

BY

ADRIAN SEBASTIAN ANDERSON

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts in Classics  
in the Graduate College of the  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012

Urbana, Illinois

Advisers:

Associate Professor Antonios Augoustakis  
Professor Emeritus David Sansone

## **ABSTRACT**

This thesis offers a reinterpretation of the martial fragments of the archaic poet Archilochus. Drawing particularly upon a fresh analysis of the new Telephus-fragment (P. Oxy. LXIX 4708), it is argued that the poet consistently advocates an ethos of cautious courage, in accordance with which every warrior is required to remain with the fighting unit and individual action is discouraged. This ethos is situated within the context of the historical development of the hoplite phalanx, and it is suggested further that a similar ideology is to be found in the Homeric epics.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I wish to thank Professor Antony Augoustakis, in whose Greek Lyric course I discovered my interest in Archilochus. His patient supervision of the development of this thesis has been invaluable, as have his suggestions and criticisms. I am grateful also to Professor David Sansone, who generously read and critiqued my penultimate draft. I have attempted to account for many comments of both; on a few occasions I have unwisely failed to heed their advice. I alone am responsible for all errors and defects.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2. ORIGINS OF THE HOPLITE PHALANX.....	10
CHAPTER 3. ARCHILOCHUS AND TELEPHUS.....	19
CHAPTER 4. THE IDEAL WARRIOR: STEADY AND RELIABLE.....	58
REFERENCES.....	83

## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Archilochus fragment 111 W has attracted little commentary, no doubt because it is only a single line, the latter half of which seems to reflect a most conventional Greek attitude. Indeed, the survival of the fragment is owed to its citation by Clement as a paraphrase of Homer, though the Homeric phrase he gives appears to be garbled.<sup>1</sup>

καὶ νέους θάρσυνε· νίκης δ' ἐν θεοῖσι πείρατα. (111 W).

“And encourage the young, but the determination of victory lies with the gods.”<sup>2</sup>

But the collocation of the sentiment that, one’s efforts aside, success ultimately depends upon the will of the gods, with the advice or admonishment to exhort the young, seems to be not a trite commonplace but a thoughtful recommendation to strike a careful balance between zealous action and sober caution.<sup>3</sup> The second phrase should be viewed as a

---

<sup>1</sup> West (1989) ad loc. adds *Il.* 7.102 parenthetically to Clement’s citation.

<sup>2</sup> The translation “determination of victory” follows the analysis of the phrase by Bergren (1975) 34-35; 115-19; 186-87, who suggests it has a legal sense, with the gods serving as judges, though she takes the phrase as an exhortation to be bold.

<sup>3</sup> Note that fr. 110 W also comes from Clement and is identified with a Homeric parallel: †ἔρξω· ἐτήτυμον γὰρ ξυνὸς ἀνθρώποις Ἄρης. “...for truly Ares is common (i.e. dispassionate) to men”. The *Iliad* passage comes from Hector’s optimistic speech before facing Achilles: ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος· καί τε κτενέοντα κατέκτα (18.309). Hector’s point is that he, the presumptive loser against Achilles, may yet be victorious; Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1395a11-16) attests to the proverbial status of ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος, used to encourage the weak to run a risk. Yet if we read 110 W in the spirit of 111 W, it has the opposite sense and is cautionary: ‘despite your eagerness, you are as likely to be killed – don’t be arrogant’. Note too that Hector’s (over)confidence is proved to be unjustified, so the gnome, like his boast that he will never flee Achilles (18.306-7), is perhaps ironic.

qualification to the first: rouse the youths (to fight bravely), but make clear to them as well that sometimes the gods are averse and their own efforts will be futile. Indeed, if the gods are opposed, no amount of exhortation will alter the outcome. We cannot, unfortunately, know who uttered this line and in what context, but I believe that the ethos it exhibits is identifiable in several other fragments of Archilochus such that a roughly consistent attitude from the poet may be outlined.

This single tetrameter verse is not only representative of Archilochus' ideas about warfare, but, as I shall argue, it also matches the ethos of the *Iliad*.<sup>4</sup> As a preliminary grounding for such an equation, let us examine the context of the *Iliad* verse (7.102, in a speech by Menelaus) that contains phraseology similar to the fragment cited by Clement. At the opening of *Iliad* 7 Hector and Alexander join battle, but almost immediately Athena and Apollo take counsel and decide to halt the fighting temporarily. Apollo's plan is to rouse the spirit of Hector to challenge one of the Danaans to single combat (7.38-42). The poet states that Helenus, the Trojan seer, understands the plan of the gods, and so he goes to advise Hector (7.44-46). Yet Helenus finishes his exhortation by telling Hector that he is not yet allotted to die, [and he knows this] for he heard the voice of the ever-living gods (7.52-53). As Kirk notes, the knowledge that Hector will not die in the duel is nowhere

---

<sup>4</sup> Archilochus is generally dated to the mid-seventh century B.C.; see Brown (1997) 43-44; Kivilo (2010) 111-15 discusses his dating in antiquity, especially his synchronization with Gyges and Homer. The dating of Homer, or rather of the poet of the *Iliad*, is vexed, though two general opinions are current: eighth-century (e.g. Kirk [1985] 1-16); mid-seventh and so roughly contemporary with Archilochus (e.g. West [1995] 203-19). I am inclined to agree with the latter assessment; any difference in date between the two cannot have been too great.

mentioned in the gods' exchange.<sup>5</sup> This detail, viewed in light of Menelaus' subsequent speech, may be relevant. At any rate, Helenus' exhortation is successful and Hector offers the challenge for one champion to fight him (7.67-91). The Achaeans sit in silence, shamed to refuse but afraid to accept (7.92-93). It is Menelaus who accepts the challenge, makes a short speech, mostly in rebuke of his comrades, but finishes by declaring:

αὐτὰρ ὑπερθεν

νίκης πείρατ' ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι (7.101-2).

“But the determination of victory is with the deathless gods above.”

Evidently, Menelaus is as hesitant as the others to oppose Hector, and with good reason. In one of the well-known apostrophes of Menelaus, the poet states that he would then have met his end at Hector's hand, since the latter was much stronger, had not the Achaean kings jumped up and restrained him (7.104-6). Menelaus is thus presented as courageous, if foolhardy. He is saved from what the poet knows would be certain death by the intervention of his comrades and especially that of his brother Agamemnon, who chides him as foolish and instructs him to endure (sc. to refuse the challenge), though suffering:

---

<sup>5</sup> Kirk (1990) ad 52-53 supposes this is either an oversight by the poet, or the conversation was fuller than the poet chose to record. I do not quite understand the reasoning of the latter; a better way to frame the poet's choice here would be to consider the audience's interpretive options: a) Helenus heard something other than what the poet has just attributed to the gods (Kirk [ibid.] views this as unlikely), b) the difference is missed, or c) the poet deliberately has Helenus misrepresent the gods' conversation. That the last is a possibility is suggested by Priam's speech to Hecuba 24.218-27 in which he admits he would reject the advice of diviners or priests had they given him the message Iris has.

οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ / ταύτης ἀφροσύνης· ἀνὰ δὲ σχέο κηδόμενός περ (7.109-10). In fact, Agamemnon's concern for his brother is seen elsewhere: in book 10, when the expedition to the Trojan camp is being prepared and Menelaus volunteers, Agamemnon, fearing for his brother, bids Diomedes to pay no heed for noble rank but to choose the best companion (10.234-40).<sup>6</sup> In book 5 Menelaus *pities* two fallen comrades and goes to face Aeneas, their killer (5.561-64). It is not Agamemnon but Nestor's son who fears for him, moves to the front lines, and stands alongside him in support (5.565-70). Menelaus repeatedly inspires the support and protection of his comrades.<sup>7</sup> Yet the advice given in book 7 is unusual, and the closest parallels for the language are, in fact, found directed at the immortals Hera and Aphrodite.

In the first instance, Hephaestus cautions his mother Hera against challenging Zeus, for, he predicts, she could not contend with him and prevail: τέτλαθι μῆτερ ἐμή, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ (1.586). Like Agamemnon's advice, the concern shown here is between family members, and Hera is exhorted to be cautious and restrain her impulses. The second example is a close parallel to the duel situation, for it occurs during a battle in progress. Aphrodite, wounded by Diomedes, complains to her mother Dione that mortals are now hurting even gods. Dione responds so as to restrain her daughter from rash behavior: τέτλαθι τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ (5.382). She goes on to console her by listing other occasions when mortals have injured gods, but ends by indirectly

---

<sup>6</sup> Willcock (2002) 223 notes that even if book 10 is by another poet, that author was clearly aware of the ethos of the rest of the *Iliad*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Willcock (2002) 221-23, who discusses these and other similar passages.



cautioning Diomedes that one who fights with the gods does not return home from battle (5.406-9), and to beware lest he fight one stronger than Aphrodite (5.411).

Agamemnon ends his speech with a similar prediction: even if Hector is now fearless and insatiate of battle, he will be glad to bend his knee (in rest), if he can escape from the coming combat (7.117-19). Unlike Helenus' assurance of victory to Hector, Agamemnon's prediction reflects the uncertainty Menelaus himself has shown, that victory depends upon the gods: the duel, if fought by comparable fighters, will be a close one.<sup>8</sup> Just as the foolish Diomedes is spurred on by Athena, so Hector is encouraged by Helenus, who alleges divine favor. The Atreidae exhibit here a greater respect for their own mortality, and this stance is not censured by any of the others. Menelaus is simply not as strong a warrior as Hector (7.111), and though he is nevertheless willing to fight, his comrades feel bound by duty and affection to restrain him. The Achaeans would gain nothing by his likely death, and so restraint and caution are believed to be the better course. Rather paradoxically, then, Menelaus' praiseworthiness consists both in his conspicuous willingness to take on a better fighter than himself and his acceptance of Agamemnon's prudent restraint (i.e., the fact that he does not actually do anything so foolhardy). We can be sure that Menelaus' behavior is actually praised by the poet because of his frequent apostrophes.<sup>9</sup> As M. Willcock has suggested, the poet goes out of his way to present a realistic and sympathetic character who must be quite different from the traditional, pre-

---

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, this is how the duel eventually plays out; Ajax and Hector fight to a draw as night falls and the heralds intervene.

<sup>9</sup> See Edwards (1991) 3; Richardson (1990) 170-74 discusses how sympathy for the character is produced by means of the apostrophe.

*Iliad* Menelaus who vengefully seeks the return of his wife.<sup>10</sup> Part of his sympathy and appeal as a character, I submit, is owed to his familiarity to the audience: he fights as they do in real life, and the fact that he *is* a hero elevates this mode of fighting. Indeed, on one occasion Menelaus even contemplates capturing alive one of the enemy who begs for mercy, but Agamemnon intervenes to chide his brother's indulgence and succeeds in changing his mind (6.37-65). This episode demonstrates both the sensitivity of Menelaus and his willingness to be reasonable and accept sound advice. We shall in the last chapter consider further the warfare represented by Menelaus in *Iliad* 17.

I submit that it is the attitude of what we may call cautious courage that is behind the one-line fragment of Archilochus. That is, it is good and proper to encourage the young to fight (here we may think, of course, of the exhortations of Tyrtaeus fr. 10-3 W and Callinus fr. 1 W), but in a measured tone that is indicative of the uncertainties of combat and the apparent caprice of the gods. This ethos is to be found in other fragments of the poet, particularly the newly discovered Telephus-fragment.<sup>11</sup> In addition, just as in the *Iliad* Menelaus is saved through the intervention of his comrades, so too does Archilochus emphasize the necessity of fighting only with the support of one's fellows. Such a style of

---

<sup>10</sup> Willcock (2002) 224-25, who notes the fact that Menelaus receives by far the most stock epithets for 'warlike,' though he is one of the less conspicuously warlike in the *Iliad*.

<sup>11</sup> I am not ignoring Dover's warning (1963) 205-12 that not every sentiment expressed in the fragments is the poet's own. As Dover (ibid.) 211-12 concedes, certain fragments probably do represent the poet's voice (such as an address to Pericles or Glaucus). The task, therefore, is to make a case for those that do show the poet's ethos; the evidence is the cumulative weight of those fragments that are mutually reinforcing.

fighting is found also in the martial elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, though they exhibit relatively unbridled exhortation, in contrast to the cautious courage ethos of Archilochus. Such a difference in focus is probably not owed to a fundamental divergence of ethos, but rather to the context of performance. One can easily imagine how poetry performed in the tent of the Spartan king before a battle would have a very different emphasis from elegies delivered at a symposium, perhaps after the completion of a conflict; D.E. Gerber even dubs Tyrtaeus “a kind of poet laureate for the state.”<sup>12</sup>

As with the preliminary analysis of fragment 111 W, some of the subsequent argumentation will depend upon comparisons with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. As already indicated, what I hope also to demonstrate is that the Archilochian ethos is neither anti-,

---

<sup>12</sup> Gerber (1997) 104. The performance context for early elegy is open to debate: West (1974) 10-13 imagines exhortation prior to a battle as distinct from “a less formal military setting”, the civilian symposium, et al. Bowie (1986) 15-16 proposes that the symposium is fundamental and martial exhortation is only a sub-species of exhortatory elegy; he elaborates (1990) 221-29 on the possibility of martial elegy being performed at the Spartan king’s campaign tent, though not necessarily in anticipation of a specific battle. The preservation and transmission of Tyrtaeus in antiquity was probably not accidental: what was best suited for Spartan ideology (especially hoplite protreptic) was preserved – perhaps at the exclusion of other works – though Bowie (1990) 224-29 suggests any popular song (theme aside) might join the repertoire. This begs the question of the grounds for Tyrtaeus’ popularity: modern critics, at least, charge him with being relatively untalented – see e.g. Adkins (1985) 67-68. The lyric poetry of Alcman, by contrast, survived in the Alexandrian canon because of its high quality and widespread appeal: Carey (2011) 437-60 argues that his poetry was both epichoric and attractive to a pan-Hellenic audience, and that it was preserved in book form early and in Sparta.

nor even un-Iliadic. Rather, the poet(s) of the two epics are from essentially the same world as Archilochus, though the former are bound by epic convention to portray the fantastical heroic world, its warrior ethic, and its methods of fighting within certain generic parameters. The celebration and propagation of the exploits of individual fighters such as Achilles, Hector, and Diomedes are not made to provide the poet's audience with realistic role models. Their deeds are extolled precisely because they are superhuman and from a legendary, bygone age.

Moreover, in addition to figures such as Achilles there are other fighters, not un-heroic, but who are more representative of real, archaic period combat, in which warriors fight not as individuals but as a member of a group. Thus, even when 'individualized' fighting is described (i.e., warriors are specified by name), it often entails fighting in pairs and with the support of comrades (sometimes also specified by name, others not). We thus find a concern with individual fighters (the *kleos* of Achilles) in addition to a more realistic account of fighting (and I do not mean here tactics alone), for *monomachia* is in fact exceptional and is treated as such by the poet.

Unlike epic, the surviving fragments of Archilochus' elegies and his iambic trimeters and trochaic tetrameters do not seem to discuss combat in quite the same terms as heroic epic – there is no mention of fighting for *kleos*, for example. This is not, I think, because Archilochus is especially ignoring or spurning such language, but because he is operating in a different poetic tradition, which has its own conventions. And not every element is different between the genres. As we shall see below, for example, the presence of the gods

in war that is so familiar from epic is found also in Archilochus (both in elegiacs and tetrameters).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> The 'new' Simonides (11 W), by contrast, shows a novel combination of epic and narrative elegiac in which the Plataean dead are compared with Achilles and his immortal fame.

## CHAPTER 2. ORIGINS OF THE HOPLITE PHALANX

In this chapter, it is necessary to consider briefly the sharply contested issue of the history of phalanx warfare and its relation to Homeric epic and martial elegy. In particular, we must ask whether some form of phalanx warfare was known to the poet of the *Iliad*, and if a similar manner of fighting was the norm for Archilochus and his contemporaries. I believe the answer to both questions is broadly affirmative, but certain cautions and qualifications should be acknowledged. The methodological problem we face is that our texts are poetic, though some elegy and perhaps Archilochus' martial tetrameters have an historical bent (and thus some historical reliability).<sup>14</sup> Moreover, as we shall see, it is not even agreed among scholars what the nature of the hoplite phalanx was, so our terminology remains rough and relative.

Much debate was generated by Joachim Latacz' study of warfare in the *Iliad*, in which he identified discrete stages of combat, the most decisive of which was mass fighting that is reflective of historical phalanx warfare.<sup>15</sup> Critics of this account, proposing a post-Homeric 'hoplite reform', fall roughly into one of two camps. Some see a technical development of the hoplite panoply, particularly the hoplite shield, as a direct response to the needs of existing tactics (i.e., phalanx fighting).<sup>16</sup> Others reject altogether the existence

---

<sup>14</sup> We see elegy addressing both old history and recent, and some of Archilochus' tetrameters seem to focus upon recent events; see Bowie (2001) 50-60.

<sup>15</sup> Latacz (1977).

<sup>16</sup> E.g., Hanson (1991) 63-84.

of phalanx tactics in the *Iliad*,<sup>17</sup> and it has recently been suggested that such warfare did not exist until the fifth century.<sup>18</sup>

There has even been disagreement about the nature of the hoplite phalanx in the classical period. G.L. Cawkwell has proposed, contrary to the orthodox image of hoplite fighting, that there were different phases of combat in lengthy hoplite contests, and that fighters might break into open order for hand-to-hand combat and later re-form the hoplite formation.<sup>19</sup> Holladay restated the orthodox view of the phalanx,<sup>20</sup> but van Wees has

---

<sup>17</sup> Snodgrass (1993) 49-54 accepts the importance of mass-fighting in the *Iliad*, but disputes the identification with phalanx warfare. He allows that technical development was significant, but believes mechanisms for hoplite enrolment were decisive for the development of the hoplite phalanx (59-61). Van Wees (1988) 2-14 dismantles the discrete phases of combat envisioned by Latacz and argues that the mass of men and the foremost fighters are really the same group, members of which repeatedly move forward to fight and withdraw to the mass for rest. Van Wees (1986) 292-95 argues that there is no complex tactical organization of the forces in the *Iliad* and that the terms *phalanx* and *stix* refer generically to a 'segment' and a 'column' of the army, respectively.

<sup>18</sup> Van Wees (2000) 125-66, esp. 155-56 proposes lowering the date of the 'developed' hoplite phalanx, perhaps even after the Persian wars. Krentz (2002) 23-39 argues further for such a dating, suggesting that the unwritten rules of phalanx warfare (not just tactics) develop only as non-hoplite arms are excluded from the phalanx, starting perhaps with the battle of Marathon, but not completed until after 480 (he notes [ibid.] 36-37 the relatively open style apparently still used by the Spartans at Thermopylae). See also Krentz (2010) 43-62, particularly the case against the prominence of the *othismos* (massed shoving) tactic.

<sup>19</sup> Cawkwell (1989) 375-89 and (1978) 150-53.

argued further that open order fighting was the *rule* for hoplites until rather late.<sup>21</sup> In response to the analysis of van Wees, a recent case has been made by Schwartz<sup>22</sup> that in the phalanx a fully frontal stance, with overlapping shields (the 'traditional' understanding of the phalanx), was used *sometimes*, as in the charge, but that this stance could alter to a shoulder-on position that allowed some greater freedom to parry and assault, though not open-order fighting.

From this overview, we may note the general lines of disagreement. First, there is no consensus as to what constitutes 'hoplite warfare' – is it the mere presence of (certain elements of?) the panoply, or the use of phalanx tactics? Nor is it agreed how close phalanx fighting was, and how much the development of this depended on the use of the panoply. My own inclination is to suppose a longer, more diffuse development of both armor and tactics. It should be evident that whatever elements in the *Iliad* and early elegy could be argued to be reflective of 'phalanx warfare' are not to be identified with what we call the hoplite phalanx in the Classical period.

It has been observed that iconographic representations of hoplite armor from the seventh and sixth centuries do not depict a uniformly attired fighting group; if absolutely consistent use of the panoply was required for its success, it becomes exceedingly difficult

---

<sup>20</sup> Holladay (1982) 94-103

<sup>21</sup> Van Wees (2000) 125-66.

<sup>22</sup> Schwartz (2002) 31-64, who restates the case that the panoply was created specifically for use with the (already existing) phalanx tactics.



to explain such depictions.<sup>23</sup> Two striking examples of such representations of diversely equipped fighting groups are found on recently published vases from Paros, dated to the end of the eighth century.<sup>24</sup> Note that these vessels are quite close to Archilochus both geographically (his home island) and chronologically. One vessel depicts on the belly two chariots driven by nude figures, men on horseback with round shields – one attacking with spear and another with sword – and a single warrior with a huge Dipylon shield who

---

<sup>23</sup> See van Wees (2000) 132-35 and (2004) 50-52; Krentz (2002) 29-30. I too do not find very convincing the suggestion (e.g., by Snodgrass [1964] 58-59) that the Boeotian shield is an artistic convention and not grounded in reality. If uniform armament were so essential for the success of the 'phalanx', such mixed depictions would be incoherent and anything but heroic (though Snodgrass argues for a prolonged development of these tactics). On the other hand, van Wees' explanation (2000) 132 of 'heroic' nudity as indicative of lighter armed fighters is unlikely to find much acceptance (Langdon [2008] 245 refers to the overriding desire to demarcate gender in art). On balance, artistic conventions no doubt distort historical reality, but it is implausible that a very vivid, exclusively artistic remembrance of a bronze age type (the so-called figure-eight shield) would find expression in a consistently altered form that is itself a development of the intermediate Dipylon shield (as Snodgrass [1964] 58 suggests). Indeed, Snodgrass (1999) 45 would rather accept the Dipylon (than the Boeotian) as real, presumably because it is the older type, despite its exaggerated appearance. Boardman (1983) 27-36 argues (persuasively to me) that neither the Dipylon nor the Boeotian shield is a heroic marker and both reflected real types. Van Wees (2000) 134 n17 corrects the mischaracterization of the Boeotian shield as impractical and unrealistic (as by Snodgrass [1999] 55).

<sup>24</sup> Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271-77.

attacks a smaller unarmed figure with a sword.<sup>25</sup> The second vase shows on the belly two opposed forces with a single fallen warrior in between. To the left of the dead is first an archer with round shield, then a shield-less archer, six horsemen variously equipped, and finally heavily armed hoplites. Opposing the archer from the other side of the corpse are first three sling-throwers without shields, followed by two hoplites, at which point the rearmost fighters of the opposition appear (oriented toward the corpse in the middle).<sup>26</sup> Particularly on the second vessel, organized, equally opposed warriors are depicted fighting with what is identified as hoplite tactics, though again they fight with diverse equipment.<sup>27</sup>

Moreover, such mixed-arms representations are well matched by literary accounts. In the *Iliad* spears are both thrown and thrust, and certain contingents are portrayed as having a particular style of armament.<sup>28</sup> Notably, the Lokrians fight with bows and slings, but do not possess helmets, shields or spears (13.714-18). They are specifically contrasted with fighters in front, who fight with embellished arms, behind whom they cast their missiles in relative safety (13.719-21). We may also note in passing here that their decision

---

<sup>25</sup> Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, with figs. 1-4 and 11 (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3523). What is identified as a Dipylon shield is not so stylized as certain Attic examples (it reaches beyond the knees and the arc cut-outs on the side are not so deep).

<sup>26</sup> Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, with figs. 5-8 (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3524); van Wees (2004) 167 sees only two sling-throwers, identifying the first figure as a spearman with three javelins.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Zaphiropoulou (2006) 276.

<sup>28</sup> See Krentz (2002) 30 n29 for further examples. Lorimer (1947) 111-32 rejected both hoplite arms and tactics for the *Iliad* and labeled passages problematic for such a view as interpolated.

to not remain in close combat (13.713) is ultimately tactically advantageous, but it would be wrong to suggest, I think, that not fighting closely is *prima facie* shameful *until* the poet states that this is a successful tactic.<sup>29</sup> The poet, in fact, gives immediately the explanation for their withdrawal: for (γάρ) they did not have helmets for defense (13.714). Not only is their action not shameful, it would be the height of folly for them to fight at close quarters, equipped as they are.<sup>30</sup>

It may be objected that such passages are few in the *Iliad*, that the typical mode of Homeric warfare is characterized by ritualized *monomachia*, war chariots, and the deeds of a select few heroes. Yet I am not the first to believe that the 'later' elements, characteristic of the seventh century, are real in the *Iliad*, and I find it excessively skeptical to suspect reflexively such elements as interpolated.<sup>31</sup> As K. Raaflaub has recently observed, the

---

<sup>29</sup> *pace* Janko (1992) *ad* 712-18.

<sup>30</sup> This may seem at odds with the second of the Parian vessels discussed above (Paros Museum, inv. no. B 3524), on which missile fighters appear fighting in the front of each force, and might lead one to imagine that distinct phases of combat, as outlined by Latacz (1977) esp. 118-29, are meant to be shown, with missile warfare occurring first. But archers at least are depicted in the front ranks on Geometric (Athenian) vases (van Wees [2004] 166-67), and these may have shields for protection (*ibid.*) 167 n6. The sling-throwers are exceptional anyhow and may be thought of as moving forward only to throw.

In any case, Zaphiropoulou (2006) 271, 275-76 suggests that the scene on the shoulder shows the recovery of the same corpse as on the belly (cf. [*ibid.*] fig 10) and that the neck has the prothesis, so we have a unified narrative focused upon a single fighter.

<sup>31</sup> Raaflaub (2008) 469-83; van Wees (2004) 249-52, the two of whom disagree, however, on the nature of archaic warfare. Schwartz (2009) 108-15 sees such elements in the *Iliad* and believes the

‘standard’ picture of warfare in the *Iliad* is a fabrication that is motivated by the desire to present in epic an exaggerated, superhuman age that is distinctly separate from that of the poet and his audience.<sup>32</sup> The extraordinary feats attributed to heroes are thus owed to the conventions of the genre, though contemporary, realistic elements are injected by the poet as well. It would be wrong, therefore, to label only the one category ‘Iliadic’ or ‘heroic’ because the realistic elements are equally ascribed to this heroic age by the poet.

Realistic, archaic period warfare is prominent in martial elegy, whereas the superhuman elements native to epic are generally few.<sup>33</sup> Tyrtaeus (11.29-30, 34 W) refers to warriors holding either sword or spear, as though either of these might be expected, and he encourages the light armed (γυμνήτες) to cast stones and javelins while crouching behind the shield of another and standing near the *panhoploi* (11.35-38 W).<sup>34</sup> For Archilochus we need mention here only in brief the possible use of a single spear (2 W), the shield that is left behind (5 W), and especially the close quarters sword fighting of the Euboeans (who are also called spear-famed), which is contrasted with the use of long-range

---

phalanx itself to be eighth century, but is skeptical about dating the poem and using it as an historical source. Most succinct on the issue is West (1966) 46 n2.

<sup>32</sup> Raaflaub (2008) 471-74.

<sup>33</sup> Note, for example, that the model warrior for Callinus (fr. 1.19 W) is worthy of the *demigods*; no fighter is θεοειδής in elegy, and the Spartan kings are only “honored by the gods” (Tyrtaeus fr. 4.3 W).

<sup>34</sup> Rock-throwers also may appear at Tyrtaeus 19.2 W, and γυμνομάχοι at 23a.14 W.

slings and bows (3 W).<sup>35</sup> The case of the Euboeans attests to the fact that certain localities might be known for particular weaponry or tactics, though the poet does not suggest that the other side will be *unequipped* for such combat (i.e. without swords). Such local specialization can, however, be exaggerated, as was seen with the example of the Lokrian contingent, who are all similarly (ill-)equipped, whereas a mixture of arms was probably normal in reality. We thus find hoplite arms alongside weaponry not generally found with the fully developed phalanx of the Classical period, together with seemingly proto-hoplite tactics.<sup>36</sup>

One thing that remains elusive is agreement on the meaning of ‘proto-hoplite tactics’. Although the profusion of bronze weaponry, chariots, and *monomachia* in the *Iliad* speaks against aligning the epic closely with what we find in Tyrtaeus, Archilochus, and

---

<sup>35</sup> Snodgrass (1964) 180 suggests that the poem predates (pre-)hoplite warfare, in part on the argument that slings are not attested before the seventh century (doubting [ibid.] 167 the *Iliad* reference 13.716), but the new Paros vase with sling-throwers discussed above moots the case. Donlan (1970) 131-42 finds it likely that the Lelantine war is discussed in 3 W (though the historicity of this war is quite uncertain), and he concludes that the transition to close-range hoplite warfare (in which long-range weapons would be used less) is here reflected.

<sup>36</sup> Snodgrass (1993) 56-58 sees such weaponry and tactics in Tyrtaeus, but remains skeptical about the *Iliad*. Cf. Anderson (1991) 15-19, who includes also Archilochus in the proto-hoplite category. Schwartz (2009) 115-23 finds the (essentially developed) phalanx in Tyrtaeus and Callinus, but sees with it a radical departure from the heroic value system. Lorimer (1947) 121-28 believed that Tyrtaeus was compelled to describe the contemporary phalanx using epic language that was ignorant of it; difficult passages (which seem to contain archaizing details) are explained as pastiche (ibid.) 126-28.

vase painting of the eighth-sixth centuries, I believe that the hints in favor of such an alignment are real and decisive. Although I generally do not wish to invoke vague reminiscences of the Bronze Age to explain the 'older' elements of Homeric warfare, I believe that these elements are conventional to heroic epic and not reflective of contemporary reality.<sup>37</sup> The poet of the *Iliad* was a product of essentially the same world as Archilochus, and, as I shall argue particularly in the final chapter, despite differences motivated by generic considerations, they shared a similar ethos with respect to war. That they both show awareness of a similar type of warfare (however we wish to term it) also points to their shared background.

---

<sup>37</sup> Though van Wees (2004) 158-60 and (1994) 9-13 attempts to find a plausible, contemporary role even for the chariot.

### CHAPTER 3. ARCHILOCHUS AND TELEPHUS

Let us now turn to the key fragments of Archilochus. Probably more than any other, the famous ‘shield poem’ (5 W), has led to the interpretation of Archilochus as representing a break from epic tradition and its values.<sup>38</sup> Yet another view has it, conversely, that the sentiment of 5 W is closely aligned with that of epic, though some downplay the significance of the poetic ‘I’ here, whereas others identify it with an epic individualism.<sup>39</sup> A recent interpretation even views it as a joke: Archilochus is caught unawares as he attends to nature behind a bush.<sup>40</sup> Let us reconsider the poem.

ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαῖων τις ἀγάλλεται, ἥν παρὰ θάμνῳι,  
ἔντος ἀμώμητον, κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων·

---

<sup>38</sup> E.g., Page (1963) 132-33, who considers it a contemporary theme in epic language (his proposal [ibid.] 286, that warfare may not be involved is rightly rejected by Dover [ibid.] 287). Cf. Gerber (1970) 15, who remarks, on the one hand, that the poem shows a “flippant attitude towards warfare” but, “that under certain circumstances discretion is the better part of valour”, statements that seem to me to be mutually incompatible. Burnett (1983) 41-42 states that the singer claims guilt of an epic ‘crime’ for which he in turn gives justification; I see no admission of a crime in the fragment. Cf. Adkins (1985) 51.

<sup>39</sup> Schwertfeger (1982) 253-80 argues that the sentiment of the fragment is not in conflict with epic and shares its values, but he thinks divine responsibility for flight is confined to epic, whereas for Archilochus it is a personal choice. See Dover (1963) 205-12 on the poetic ‘I’. Rankin (1977) 42-44 treads a sort of middle course, that Archilochus’ view transcends the heroic code but also reflects what Rankin sees as the individualism of Odysseus or Achilles.

<sup>40</sup> Anderson (2008) 255-60. Jaeger (1939) 118-19 too sees humor, but as a manifestation of the poet’s perceived inadequacy to the heroic warrior ideal.

αὐτὸν δ' ἐξεσάωσα. τί μοι μέλει ἀσπίς ἐκείνη;

ἐρρέτω· ἐξαῦτις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω.

“Some Saian rejoices in the shield, which – blameless weapon – I left behind beside a bush against my will. But I saved myself. Why should I care about that shield? To hell with it. Once more, I will get one not worse.”

Particular attention should be paid to the remark *against my will*. The train of thought begins with the fact of the object’s loss, then turns to the speaker’s role in its loss: he left it (and fled), but not by choice. It has been suggested that the mention of the speaker’s unwillingness refers to the compulsion of a god, and we may consider further this possibility in the context of the Telephus poem, below.<sup>41</sup> At any rate, the speaker does not explain why he had to leave his shield, but it seems reasonable to venture that it would have hindered his flight from battle: flight entails shield-tossing.<sup>42</sup> The qualification is not apologetic or pleading, but indicates the speaker’s priorities: he would rather have kept his shield and fought, but circumstances (whatever they were) forced his flight.<sup>43</sup> The second couplet reaffirms these priorities; if he had kept his shield, he would have lost his life.

But Archilochus is not here rejecting wholesale the value of martial courage (i.e., the heroic ethos), as we see in the last line of the fragment. ἐξαῦτις gets mistranslated as

---

<sup>41</sup> Katsonopoulou (2008) 292.

<sup>42</sup> See, e.g., Lorimer (1947) 79.

<sup>43</sup> Lavelle (2008) 148 accepts (following van Wees [2004] 172) that no particular shame was attached to the act of leaving behind one’s shield, as it later became (notably at Athens), but he nevertheless reads the fragment as a ‘rationalizing apology’. I prefer to view the fragment as a boast that next time he will be victorious, that his weaponry is incidental to his success or failure.



‘another time,’<sup>44</sup> or ‘another [sc. shield],’<sup>45</sup> but really it means ‘again,’ ‘once more.’<sup>46</sup>

κτήσομαι should refer, I believe, to despoiling the enemy, and the litotes naturally suggests the new shield will be even better. For the force of the verb, we may compare its occurrence in Achilles’ speech rejecting the embassy of Agamemnon. He declines Agamemnon’s offer of a bride, for Peleus will find him a suitable one instead (9.388-97). Indeed, he continues, his heart has been eager to delight such a wife with the possessions which the aged Peleus has won (κτήμασι τέρπεσθαι τὰ γέρων ἐκτήσατο Πηλεΐδης, 9.400). The contrast Achilles here draws is between the legitimate *winnings* that Peleus earned and that will be Achilles’ patrimony, and the *ex post facto* bribe of Agamemnon that is meant to secure Achilles’ participation. As B. Hainsworth notes, this rhetoric seems to stand in contrast to the concern elsewhere shown in the *Iliad* for material possessions.<sup>47</sup> But the key factor is the *legitimacy* of one’s possessions – the κτήματα with Helen are at issue because they were lawlessly stolen.<sup>48</sup> Tripods are thus *won* (κτητοί, 9.406), not simply gotten or acquired, and so the verb is marked. In fragment 5 W, then, the speaker hints at

---

<sup>44</sup> Gerber (1999a) 83.

<sup>45</sup> West (1993) 14.

<sup>46</sup> See *Iliad* 3.433, Helen telling Paris to challenge Menelaus to fight *again* (cf. 1.223, 13.531); at 5.134 the sense of repetition is combined with a physical return to the fighting. At Archilochus 13.9 repetition is implicit: misfortune ever moves on to a new victim; so at Hes. *Th.* 915 Zeus *again* conceives a passion (this time for Mnemosyne).

<sup>47</sup> Hainsworth (1993) ad 393-400.

<sup>48</sup> Note, however, that plundering and cattle rustling are viewed as legitimate means of acquisition; see e.g. *Il.* 9.406.

the fact that his now lost shield was itself legitimately won (i.e. in combat), for, he says, he will be legitimately winning one *again*. And not only does he say he will win another, but he boasts that it will be as good or better, which suggests his notional combatant will be correspondingly worthy. Such boasting, if that is what we may call it, is then quite in keeping with the heroic stance of the epic warrior.

What stands out, however, is the emphatic statement that the speaker saved himself. As I shall attempt to demonstrate, Archilochus focuses upon the cohesion of the fighting group; individual exploits are discouraged and fighters must look out for one another. I would speculate that there is another contrast implied in this fragment beyond that of the fate of the warrior and the shield. The speaker saved *himself*; no comrade assisted him. As noted below, even when in rout the warriors of the *Iliad* help to rescue one another (e.g. Menelaus and Odysseus, 11.456-71; Nestor and Diomedes, 8.79-171), and such a scenario is not entirely unrealistic. There may then be a remonstrance here that others fled first, leaving the speaker to fend for himself.<sup>49</sup> Such a situation would give meaning also to the oblique οὐκ ἐθέλων (such an interpretation, that his comrades fled first, would not be incompatible with the notion of divine compulsion). Without further context, however, this scenario must remain a possibility, though in the last chapter we will return to this theme.

---

<sup>49</sup> At *Iliad* 17.597 the poet specifies the warrior, Peneleos, who initiates the flight of the Achaeans, but, as if to excuse, he makes clear that Zeus with the aegis was the ultimate cause (17.593-96) and Peneleos' wounding by Polydamas the proximate one (17.598-600). As Edwards (1991) ad 597 observes, it is even noted by the scholia that Peneleos is not a coward: οὐ δειλός, εἴπερ εἴκει Δῖι. Archilochus may thus have judged the initial flight of his comrades unwarranted (inasmuch as there was no divine compulsion), but once the rout is begun, all are forced to flee or else be killed.

I should, nevertheless, maintain that the phrasing of *saving oneself* is not about the valuing of the self *qua* individual, as others have maintained.<sup>50</sup> Rather, the self is valued inasmuch as he belongs to a fighting group – the loss of each member correspondingly diminishes the integrity of the whole.

The sentiment that the loss of an individual equates to a loss for the fighting group is found in the *Iliad* as well. The poet describes Odysseus wounded, and the sight of his blood draws on all of the Trojans (11.456-60); Odysseus three times calls out for help, and three times Menelaus hears him (11.461-63). Yet instead of immediately running to his aid, Menelaus calls on Telamonian Ajax for reinforcements (11.464-71). Note again that Menelaus is loyal and reliable, but like a real-life warrior he realizes he needs the help of his comrades, even though he is a hero himself. In his address to Ajax, he remarkably conjectures the situation – Odysseus is alone (μοῦνον ἑόντα) and surrounded by Trojans (11.467-68). He exhorts Ajax to come with him and help, but he reiterates and expands upon his concern:

δείδω μή τι πάθησιν ἐνὶ Τρώεσσι μονωθείς

ἑσθλὸς ἑών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖσι γένηται (11.470-71).

Odysseus is again stressed as being alone, and I note that the participle μονωθείς is found only here in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey* (15.386; the finite verb at 16.117, discussed in chapter 4), so Menelaus is being quite emphatic here about his concern for Odysseus. The corollary to Menelaus' fear that Odysseus will euphemistically 'suffer something' is the result his death will have on the Danaans. In one respect this yearning (ποθή) for the hypothetically lost Odysseus can be understood simply as sorrow for the loss of a friend,

---

<sup>50</sup> So Rankin (1977) 43-44.

but in the context of battle in which Menelaus is presently engaged it makes sense too that the loss of Odysseus will have an immediate consequence for his comrades. Objectively, they would be at a disadvantage for the loss of one of their best fighters, but it hardly needs documenting how the loss of a leader has an enormously deleterious effect on morale. We may presume, therefore, that the yearning felt by the group for a lost comrade is directly proportional to his military value to them. Menelaus does not sentimentally refer to the yearning to be felt by himself as a friend, but rather that of the host at large.

The tension between the actions and interests of the individual and those of the group or army are explored by Archilochus in the new Telephus-poem, and again the poet's focus is on the issue of flight. I provide as a baseline the most recent text and translation of Obbink, though alternatives to some of the readings will be adduced in the discussion as needed.<sup>51</sup>

εἰ δὲ] . [ . . . . ] . [ ] . . θεοῦ κρατερῇ[ς ὑπ' ἀνάγκης  
 οὐ χρηὶ ἀν]αλ[κείη]ν καὶ κακότητα λέγει[ν,  
 π]ήμ[α]τ' εὔ[ ]εῖμ]εθα δ[η]ι]α φυγεῖν· φεύγ[ειν δέ τις ὥρη·  
 5            καί ποτ[ε μ]οῦνος ἐὼν Τήλεφος Ἀρκα[σίδης]  
              Ἀργείων ἐφόβησε πολὺν στρατ[όν,] οἳ δὲ φέβοντο  
              ἄλκιμ[οι,] ἧ τόσα δὴ μοῖρα θεῶν ἐφόβει,  
              αἰχμηταὶ περ ἐόντε[ς,] ἐϋρρείτης δὲ Κ[αῖκος]  
              π]ιπτόντων νεκύων στείνεται καὶ [πεδίου  
 10        Μύσιον, οἳ δ' ἐπὶ θῖν'α πολυφλοίσβοι[ο θαλάσσης]  
              χέρσ'] ὑπ' ἀμειλίκτου φωτὸς ἐναιρό[μενοι

---

<sup>51</sup> Obbink (2006) 1-9.

προ]τροπάδην ἀπέκλινον ἐϋκνήμ[ιδες Ἀχαιοί·

ἀ]σπάσιοι δ' ἐς νέας ὤ[κ]υπόρ[ο]υς [έσέβαν

παῖδές τ' ἄθανάτων καὶ ἀδελφοί, [οὓς Ἀγαμέμνων

15 Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερὴν ἤγε μαχησομένο[υς.

οἱ δὲ τότε βλαφθέντες ὁδοῦ παρὰ θ[ῖν' ἀφίκοντο,

Τε]ύθραντος δ' ἑρατὴν πρὸς πόλιν [έ]ξ[έπεσον,

ἔ]νθα [μ]ένος πνείοντες ὁμῶς αὐτο[ί τε καὶ ἵπποι

ἀφρ[αδί]ηι μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀκηχέ[δατο·

20 φ]άντο γὰρ ὑψίπυλον Τρώων πόλιν εἰς[αναβαίνειν

αἰ]ψα· μ[ά]την δ' ἐπάτεον Μυσίδα πυροφόρο[ν.

Ἡρακλ]έης δ' ἤντησ[ε] βοῶν ταλ[α]κάρδιον [υῖόν,

οὔ]ρον ἀμ[ε]λ[ι]κ[τον] δηῖωι ἐν [πολ]έμ[ωι,

Τ]ήλεφον, ὃς Δαναοῖσι κακὴν [τ]ό[τε φύζαν ἐνόρσας

25 ἦ]ρειδε [πρό]μαχος, πατρὶ χαριζόμε[ενος.

“If there is no need to call it weakness and cowardice, (to suffer) under the compulsion of a god, then we did well to hasten to flee our dire pains: there exists a proper time for flight. Even once Telephus, descendant of Arkasos, by himself put to flight the great army of Argives, and they fled – indeed, so greatly was the fate of the gods routing them – powerful spear-men though they were. The fair-flowing river Kaikos and the plain of Mysia were stuffed with the falling corpses, while the well-greaved Achaeans, being slain at the hands of the relentless man (Telephus), turned off with headlong speed to the shore of the much-resounding sea. Gladly did they embark on their swift ships, the sons of the immortals and brothers, whom

Agamemnon was leading to holy Ilios to wage war. But on that occasion, because they had lost their way, they had arrived at that shore. They had set upon the lovely city of Teuthras, and there, snorting fury with their horses, alike in their delusion, came in distress of spirit. For they thought they were quickly mounting the high-gated city of Troy, but in vain were they treading on wheat-bearing Mysia. And Heracles came to face (them), as he shouted to his brave-hearted son Telephus, fierce and pitiless in cruel battle, who, inciting unfortunate flight in the Danaans, strove in the front ranks on that occasion to gratify his father.”

It must be acknowledged that much of the interpretation of the fragment depends upon the reconstruction of lines 2-4, particularly the first person plural verb [εἴμ]εθα, which, if correct, references the outcome of a contemporary battle that is compared with the mythical exemplum that follows. West adduces adesp. iamb. 38 (discussed in chapter 4) as a parallel for the view that there is a proper time for flight.<sup>52</sup> I also consider these fragments to support one another, and the identification of Archilochus as author, guaranteed by identification of the hand with that of P. Oxy. VI 854 (containing scraps of fr. 4 W, ascribed to Archilochus by Athenaeus), is reinforced by the resemblance with the sentiment of fr. 5 W.

What has not received comment, however, is how disproportionately great is the attention paid to the theme of flight in the fragments we now possess for Archilochus. The new fragment is characterized by editors as Archilochus’ defense of himself and his fellows for fleeing in battle – a sort of *apologia*.<sup>53</sup> Are the events described at the beginning of the

---

<sup>52</sup> West (2006) 12.

<sup>53</sup> West (2006) 12; Obbink (2006) 7; Barker and Christensen (2006) 11.

fragment the same as fr. 5 W, or are these two separate occasions when flight was necessary? If the same event is referenced, it would seem strange to compose two separate poems – one quite elaborate – for an occasion perhaps better forgotten. Obbink tentatively suggests a connection between Archilochus, who leaves his shield by a bush, and Telephus, who is tripped by a vine and loses his shield.<sup>54</sup> Although I agree with Obbink that Telephus' own flight follows after the fragment breaks off, I do not see a very strong connection between Archilochus' shield-propping bush and a vine shoot tripping Telephus when he is already in flight; nor does Telephus save himself, for he is wounded.

If, on the other hand, the circumstances of the new fragment are different from those of fr. 5 W, we may begin to suspect that this is a common theme for the poet. If adesp. iamb. 38 is also ascribed to Archilochus, he broaches the topic in both elegy and iambus. Although these poems may be described as justifying flight in (a particular) battle, the recurrence of the theme suggests that self-defense is not the driving motive, and the poet is not pleading. Rather, the new fragment in particular might be seen as primarily didactic in purpose, an instance of the sentiment of fr. 111 W to be courageous but mindful that success or victory lies with the gods.

The role of the gods in determining the outcome of a battle seems to figure at the opening of the new fragment (v. 2). It is noteworthy that the god is apparently not specified, presumably because the poet and his comrades are hesitant to assign particular blame without cause (cf. Achilles' exhortation to consult the experts to determine what has caused Apollo's wrath, *Il.*1.62-67). Similarly, the dispensation of the gods is made literally

---

<sup>54</sup> Obbink (2005) 21 and (2006) 7-8, noting, however, that the shield detail is only explicitly mentioned in Philostratus' *Heroicus* (13.4-14.1; 23.1; 23.24).

responsible for turning the Argives to flight (v. 7). The gods appear elsewhere in battle narratives in Archilochus, and when the propitiousness of the god is being described, the deity may be named (notably Athena).<sup>55</sup>

Of course, when it comes to the mythical material in the new fragment, different conventions apply, and the interventions of divinities can be recalled by the poet with the same certainty as the epic bard. In all likelihood, Heracles appears in an epiphany to his son (v. 22), and if we follow the standard treatments of the myth, Dionysus will manifest as the vine-shoot that trips Telephus.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> See fr. 94.1-3 W; perhaps 91.30; 98.7, 13; adesp. el. 61.3, 9, which is now assigned with certainty to Archilochus; see Obbink (2006) 1. In fr. 108 W the poet calls on Hephaestus, begging him to become his propitious ally. Bowie (2001) 57 discusses the role of the gods in elegy and Archilochus' tetrameters; he suggests that recent history (battles) may have been discussed in terms similar to those of epic, e.g., with the appearance of divinities. Obbink (2005) 21 cites fr. 16 W, in which the poet reminds Pericles how the quasi-divinities τύχη and μοῖρα grant all things to mortals.

<sup>56</sup> The detail of the vine-shoot is not found in Proclus' summary, where we are only told that Telephus comes out to defend the city, kills Thersander son of Polynices, and is himself wounded by Achilles. Apollodorus *epit.* 3.17 states that Telephus armed the Mysians and killed many Greeks, including Thersander, but fled before Achilles and became entangled in the vine-shoot, whereupon he was wounded. The A scholia to *Iliad* 1.59 = *Cypria* fr. 20 Bernabé (*PEG* I) essentially agree with Apollodorus, adding that Dionysus was angered at Telephus' failure to offer honors. See Gantz (1993) 578-79, who argues for the antiquity of the Achilles-Telephus episode; so also Preiser (2000) 41-48.



As for the appearance of Heracles, the reading Ἡρακλ]έης δ' ἤγνησ[ε] needs comment. West reads ηἰτησε on the papyrus, but he emends because ἀντάω gives better sense.<sup>57</sup> I agree that, assuming the relative clause of vv. 24-25 is correct, an accusative object or infinitive to go with the verb of asking would be too far away in v. 26. Yet both West and Obbink translate 'and Heracles came to face them', by which I assume the Achaeans are understood as object.<sup>58</sup> This seems to me very difficult to supply, for βοῶν has Telephus as object.<sup>59</sup> I think it easier to understand rather that Heracles is coming to meet his son, and that this is an epiphany. In fact, ἀντάω can refer to the meeting of family members in epic: notably, *Il.* 6.399, of Andromache meeting Hector; *Od.* 4.201, of Nestor never having met his brother Antilochus (~*Il.* 4.375, of Agamemnon never having met Tydeus).<sup>60</sup> As for meeting in the sense of epiphany, the related verb ἀντιάω occurs with this meaning in the *Odyssey*: 13.292, of a god (i.e. Athena) meeting Odysseus and 13.312, of a man (i.e. Odysseus) meeting Athena; 24.56 of Thetis coming to mourn over the dead Achilles.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, Heracles appears, exhorting (and supporting) his son, who is temporarily successful at routing the Achaeans. In the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* there seems to be

---

<sup>57</sup> West (2006) 15.

<sup>58</sup> West (2006) 12; Obbink (2006) 5.

<sup>59</sup> See Obbink (2005) 39 for the accusative with βοάω. ἀντάω doesn't take an acc. object; E. *IA* 150 is corrupt.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. also *Il.* 7.423, where the armies meet, but for the purpose of gathering their dead.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. *Od.* 12.88, of a god meeting Scylla (in a possibly hostile sense).

a correspondence between the exploits of Heracles and those of his son, in part no doubt to reinforce the genealogical connection:

ἢ τέκε] Τήλεφον Ἀρκασίδην Μυσῶν βασιλῆ[α,  
 μιχθε]ῖσ' ἐν φιλότῃτι βίῃι Ἡρακλεείῃι  
 εὔτε μεθ' ἵππους στεῖχεν ἀγαυοῦ Λαομέδοντο[ς,  
 οἷ           ]. ἄριστοι ἐν Ἀσ[ί]δι ἔτραφεν αἴῃι·  
           Δαρδαν]ιδῶν μεγαθύμων φύλον ἐναῖρ[  
                   κ]είνης δέ τε γῆς ἐξήλασε πάσης.  
 αὐτὰρ Τήλεφος] ἔτραπ' Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτών[ων  
                   ]ε μελαινάων ἐπὶ ν[ηῶν  
                   ] πέλασεν χθονὶ βω[τιανείρῃι  
                   ]ε βίῃ τ' ἀνδροκτασίῃ τε           (165.8-17 M-W).<sup>62</sup>

“Who bore Telephus, descendant of Arcasus, king of the Mysians, after she mingled with the might of Heracles, when he was going after noble Laomedon’s horses, which were the finest reared in the land of Asia...slew the race of great-hearted Dardanians...drove out from the whole of that land. But Telephus routed...of the bronze tunic-wearing Achaeans...upon dark ships...brought to the nourishing earth...force and manslaughter.”

Auge has sex with Heracles, but the detail is added that he attacked the Dardanians (vv. 8-13). In the next lines, it seems, Telephus’ rout of the Achaeans is described (vv. 14-17),

<sup>62</sup> I omit the first seven lines; 18-25 yield little that is intelligible.

though his name must be supplied and the papyrus becomes less intelligible at this point.<sup>63</sup>

The detail of Heracles' rout of the Dardanians may have been included because the poet had in mind his role in the later Telephus episode, which was by contrast only partially successful.

The sequel to the Archilochus fragment probably included the loss of Telephus' support from Heracles, or we might imagine Heracles and Dionysus feuding from opposite sides, much as we find the gods doing in the *Iliad*. Perhaps the simplest way to reverse the action would be a narrative interruption such as 'but then the scales of Zeus tipped against Telephus....'<sup>64</sup> Interestingly, in a fragment of a Hellenistic or later hexameter epic we find a retrospective discussion of the Achaeans' conflict with Telephus, how the former would never have come to Troy had Telephus successfully killed them all:

[ἐ]ξαπίνης ἐπέδησεν ἀνωῖστο[ισι κλάδοισιν,  
[οὔ] κεν ἔτι ζῶοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον [Ἀχαιοί,  
[ἐ]νθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο, ἐν[θ' Ἀγαμέμνων

---

<sup>63</sup> See Hirschberger (2004) 340 for the identification of the Telephus-story. I am not sure on what grounds Most (2007) 185 bases his translation, "Then Telephus] fled from the Achaeans with their bronze tunics". Supplements proposed for 165.15 M-W are e.g. ἀσπιστὰς καὶ ἔβησ]ε (Grenfell-Hunt) and λαὸν ὃ περ τότε ἐπῆλθ]ε (Rzach), either providing the direct object of ἔτραπε (= he [i.e. Telephus] put to rout the host/shield-bearers of the bronze tunic-wearing Achaeans). The active ἔτραπε used intransitively is rejected at *Il.* 16.658, for it rather governs δίφρον; see Janko (1992) ad loc. Euripides *Suppl.* 718 ἔτρεψαν ἐς φυγὴν πόδα is exceptional in the sense 'fled', but πόδα as direct object makes the difference; see Collard (1975) ad loc.

<sup>64</sup> For the scales of Zeus in Archilochus, cf. fr. 91.30 W; 144.2 W(?).

[ὦ]λετο, καὶ τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλῆα

Τήλεφος ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἑκτορ[ος ἀντίον ἐλθεῖν (P. Oxy. 214.1-5 = P. Lond. 1181 = *Coll. Alex. epica adesp.* 3 [76-78 Powell]).<sup>65</sup>

“Suddenly (he?) bound him with unexpected shoots; the Achaeans would not have stayed alive and come to Ilium, but there Menelaus would have fallen, there Agamemon would have perished, and the best among the Argives, (Achilles), Telephus would have slain before he came face to face with Hector.”

Included among those who would have been killed is “the best among the Argives,” and Achilles’ name is suitably supplied at the end of the line (v. 4). At the start of the fragment what actually occurred seems to be described (v. 1).<sup>66</sup> Although the binder is unnamed, it is most likely Dionysus, and there is, it seems, a reference to vine shoots. At least according to this epic, then, it is not the overpowering might of Achilles that clinches victory, but the intervention of the god. I therefore suggest that the scene is not one lone warrior coming upon another in *monomachia*, but a sudden turn of events brought about by the gods. However this may be, I think it entirely likely that the narrative in the Archilochus fragment does not break off short of Telephus’ flight and wounding.<sup>67</sup> We must, therefore, reconsider the point of the mythical exemplum, if that is what it is, and decide just what message Archilochus is conveying.

---

<sup>65</sup> The fragment continues for another 16 lines, but the focus is upon the speaker’s present plight – there is a prayer for a truce between Trojans and Argives (vv. 12-13).

<sup>66</sup> Powell, unlike Grenfell-Hunt, prints the end of the line without a bracket.

<sup>67</sup> West (2006) 17 thinks the point of the myth is simply to illustrate a rout of the Achaeans, so he supposes the narration does not continue much beyond the end of the fragment.

The opening of the mythical narrative gives us our first clue as to theme: Telephus is alone (v. 5), but puts to flight a great host (v. 6). There seems to be a sharp contrast between the lone fighter, Telephus, assaulting the great forces of the Achaeans, much as we find in the *Iliad* with the exploits of Diomedes, Hector, and Achilles. That Telephus fights alone is perhaps prefigured by his parentage, for Heracles is the lone warrior *par excellence*. This may also have been the standard version of the myth already for Archilochus: Proclus in his summary of the *Cypria* simply has him come out to defend his city (no other force is mentioned), though Apollodorus (*epit.* 3.17) does refer to Telephus arming the Mysians. In Philostratus the narrator states that the poets relate how the Achaeans plundered Mysia, and how Telephus was wounded while fighting *on behalf of* his people – not, for example, leading his army (*Heroicus* 23.4), but the narrator seems to go on to give a different version, in which the Achaeans can barely land (let alone go about plundering) because of Mysian arrows (23.14), and in which Telephus musters a great force, an alliance greater than that at Troy (23.9-13). When Telephus' wounding is actually described, however, it is said that he would have died, had not the Mysians run together to take him from the battle (23.24). This last detail suggests perhaps that there is a contrast between Telephus (possibly fighting alone) and the rest of the Mysians who must act as one to save their king.

In addition, Pindar curiously describes Patroclus standing alongside the other Greeks (Achilles and the Atreidae), yet somehow *alone*, against Telephus:

...τοῦ παῖς ἄμ' Ἀτρείδαις

Τεύθραντος πεδίων μολῶν ἔστα σὺν Ἀχιλλεῖ

μόνος, ὅτ' ἀλκάντας Δαναοὺς τρέψαις ἀλίσαισιν

πρύμναις Τήλεφος ἔμβαλεν· (Pi. O. 9.70-73).

“...whose child (i.e., Patroclus) together with the Atreidae, coming to the plain of Teuthras, stood with Achilles, alone, when Telephus, putting to flight the brave Danaans, set upon their sea-going prows.”

There may be a special point to *μόνος* here, emphatically placed between the ostensibly lone Patroclus and the actually solitary Telephus, who defends his town. Perhaps Pindar is echoing a tradition that Telephus was compelled to fight without assistance. At least in the Archilochus fragment, aside from the appearance of Heracles, Telephus is not said to have any support. In line 25 *μοῦνος* was read in the *editio princeps* and labeled an instance of ‘ring composition’; Obbink now confirms the reading [πρό]μαχος, but he suggests this amounts to the same.<sup>68</sup> We shall consider in chapter 4 the significance of the terms *πρόμαχος* and *μοῦνος*, particularly in comparison with the *Iliad*. It suffices to note for the moment that Telephus is specifically alone, against the mass of the Achaean army.

At first glance, such references to the solitary hero seem to be of a piece with, e.g. Callinus fr. 1.18-21 W, a description of the people’s longing for the lost fighter who, being alone, performs deeds worthy of many men. Yet how could Archilochus employ Telephus as the paradigm of the undefeatable enemy (before whom it is right to flee) without also calling to mind the immediate sequel – Telephus’ own flight? I suggest that there are hints to what follows even in the fragment we possess.

*τόσα* in line 7 should, I think, be adverbial (limitative), “and those brave men were fleeing, indeed, so far (long) as the dispensation of gods was routing them, though they

---

<sup>68</sup> Obbink (2005) 34, 40; and (2006) 7.

were spearmen”.<sup>69</sup> The parallel for this use is τόσσον in fr. 15 W. Obbink suggests the word may correlate the μοῖρα θεῶν of the narrative with that of the poet and his audience: “so great a fate as this (i.e. our present predicament).”<sup>70</sup> Yet I doubt that an adjective strictly of size (not quality) is appropriate to describe μοῖρα. And Obbink seems to translate as an adverb (but not limitatively): “indeed, so greatly was the fate of the gods routing them.”<sup>71</sup> West reads instead ἐ]ς τόσσα and translates “so greatly did the divine doom frighten them.”<sup>72</sup> But this assumes three letters in the gap instead of two (though one is iota), and Obbink affirms his own reading: “dispexit R. Janko.”<sup>73</sup> A. Nicolosi suggests this is but a general reference to the supremacy of fate decided by the gods over men.<sup>74</sup> But the context is essential, for the poet has also just said that Telephus routed the army (ἐφόβησε v. 6). If the two imperfects (though φέβοντο of v. 6 is wholly reconstructed)<sup>75</sup> are taken

---

<sup>69</sup> Suggested by Obbink (2005) 34, who notes also the parallel in 15 W.

<sup>70</sup> Obbink (2005) 34.

<sup>71</sup> Obbink (2005) 32 and (2006) 5.

<sup>72</sup> West (2006) 11, 12.

<sup>73</sup> Obbink (2006) 2 *ap. crit.* For the combination ῥ...δῆ in Archilochus, cf. fr. 188.4 W (with πολλά); cf. Sem. 22.1 W.

<sup>74</sup> Nicolosi (2007) 303.

<sup>75</sup> West (2006) 11 supplies ο[ύδ’ ἐγένοντο at the end of line 6, but it would not seem to really suit the poet’s message to say that the Argives were not brave. The same difficulty applies to West’s alternative (2006) 13, ο[ἷ δ’ ἐλάθοντο | ἀλκῆ]ς, which also leaves unfilled the gap of two letters before ῥ τόσσα. The suggestion of Magnelli (2006) 9 ο[ύδ’ ἔτι μεῖναν / ἔτ’ ἔμειναν conflates ‘nor did the brave remain’ and ‘nor did they remain brave.’ The parallel which he cites ἐνθ’ οὐδ’ ἴφθιμοι Λύκιοι μένον (*Il.* 16.659) is different because Λύκιοι provides the subject, which I doubt ἄλκιμοι (v.

closely together, they serve to explain and somewhat correct the aorist: the Argives did not flee *full stop*, but *were fleeing* so long as the gods were against them (and favoring Telephus).<sup>76</sup>

In addition, Telephus is twice called ἀμείλικτος (vv. 11, 23), which is not a very common word and seems quite strong (also in Archilochus at fr. 159.1 W(?), without context). We should compare ἀμείλιχον (fr. 7.2 W) with which West reads (after Peek) ἐν [φρεσὶ θυμόν.<sup>77</sup> Slings doubts that fragment 7 W is military paraenesis (as is suggested by Peek and West), and supposes that such a word is generally negative and so should apply to the enemy.<sup>78</sup> In its two occurrences in the *Iliad* ἀμείλικτος modifies ὄπα; the first instance (11.137) refers to Agamemnon's pitiless response to the pleas of Peisander and Hippolochus for mercy (with *gentle* words, *ibid.*). The second occurrence is with Achilles' response in the famous scene of Lycaon begging for mercy (21.98). At *h. Cer.* 259 the water of Styx, by which the gods swear their oaths, is similarly described as unyielding. The application to a human, then, indicates that the warrior is not to be pleaded with for mercy or restraint. In Hesiod (*Th.* 659), however, the adjective is used of the bonds holding the

---

7) can do without the article. Rather: 'the brave (Achaeans) *were fleeing*, despite being spearman' (the thought continued by the appositive in v. 8).

<sup>76</sup> We may compare *Iliad* 15.343-45, "Ὅφρ' οἱ τοὺς ἐνάριζον ἀπ' ἔντεα, τόφρα δ' Ἀχαιοὶ...φέβοντο (while the Trojans stop to strip arms, the Achaeans were fleeing). My explanation also dispels the objection of Luppe (2006) 2 to the imperfect after the aorist; the lack of an explicit direct object for ἐφόβει does not seem problematic to me.

<sup>77</sup> West (1985) 9; Peek (1985) 15.

<sup>78</sup> Slings (1986) 1-2; cf. West (1985) 9-10; Peek (1985) 15.



Hundred-Handers, and the point emphasized there is that their escape was possible only through the contrivances of Zeus (cf. 653, 658); that is, the unbreakable bonds were in fact broken.<sup>79</sup> Perhaps, therefore, the repeated use of the adjective with Telephus is another set-up for the reversal of the narrative: Telephus may be implacable against the great host of the Achaeans, but *then* the designs of the god(s) turn against him, Achilles appears, and so forth.

Moreover, the second (apparent) use of the adjective (v. 23) occurs with the supplement οὔριον, made by West.<sup>80</sup> I am less certain, however, that another substantive is absolutely required to stand at the beginning of 23 in apposition to τάλ[α]κάρδιον [υἱόν], as West wants.<sup>81</sup> I compare fr. 193.1-3 and 114.4 W for the asyndeton of two adjectives and a participle; in any case, if an appositive is desired, Τήλεφον stands at the beginning of 24. I suggest δηρὸν (sc. χρόνον) at the start of 23, yielding the sense “for a long time implacable in cruel battle.”<sup>82</sup> This would then give another hint to the sequel – Telephus is successful for a time at warding off alone the attackers, but eventually the tide of battle will turn. Interestingly, δηρὸν often occurs in the *Iliad* with a negative in phrases such as

---

<sup>79</sup> Cf. West (1966) ad 659, who notes that elsewhere in early epic the adjective applies only to things that might be object of μελίσσειν.

<sup>80</sup> Note that Obbink’s (2006) 5 translation “fierce and pitiless” is loose; rather “implacable watcher/guardian”.

<sup>81</sup> West (2006) 15.

<sup>82</sup> For δηρὸν with an adjective, cf. *Il.* 17.41; with a participle at *Od.* 5.396. It is often line-initial e.g. *Il.* 5.120, 5.285, 10.371; cf. now Si. 17.5 W, perhaps from the (elegiac) Plataea poem, but see Kowerski (2005) 54-56.

‘remaining long in battle’ or ‘living long (i.e. surviving combat)’ (e.g. 2.298; 5.120; 5.285; 10.371; 16.852). The phrase would, however, be ambiguous here (it could be taken in the sense “he remained steadfast in cruel battle”), keeping the audience in suspense about what will follow.

If, on the other hand, οὔ]ρον is retained,<sup>83</sup> we should consider its implications. In the *Iliad*, it is only applied to Nestor (four times). The first instance (8.80) is noteworthy, for the context is one of flight: the Achaeans are gripped by fear, and the heroes Idomeneus, Agamemnon, and the Ajaxes, though attendants of Ares, (cf. vv. 7, 8 of the Telephus fragment) do not remain steadfast (8.76-79). But things are otherwise for Nestor:

Νέστωρ οἶος ἔμιμνε Γερήνιος, οὔρος Ἀχαιῶν,  
οὔ τι ἐκῶν, ἀλλ’ ἵππος ἐτείρετο... (8.79-80).

“Gerenian Nestor remained alone, watcher of the Achaeans, in no way willingly, but his horse was distressed....”

Note that the scene presented is far more ‘cowardly, un-heroic’ than that supposedly found in Archilochus’ shield poem, for Nestor doesn’t want to remain in battle, and the poet must explain why he is compelled to *stay*, whereas the flight of Archilochus was made against his will.

There is also a double meaning with οἶος ἔμιμνε, for it may be taken to mean that Nestor out of all the other frightened Achaeans alone remained (i.e. courageously), and this is perhaps the more obvious interpretation until the next line clarifies the situation. In

---

<sup>83</sup> West (2006) 15 refers to line 17 of the Hellenistic or later hexameter epic (P. Oxy 241, sup. cit.) where, as he translates, “bulwark of the Achaeans” may be read (though, as here, the first two letters of οὔρον are missing), but it is not obvious that Telephus is still being discussed there.

context, the second interpretation is that Nestor remained alone, isolated, and the sequel bears out this sense. For the poet states that Nestor would then have died, had not Diomedes noticed his plight (8.90-91). Interestingly, Diomedes calls to Odysseus for assistance, upbraiding him for his flight (8.92-96), and it is lines such as these that have given rise, I suspect, to the notion that flight from combat is always considered cowardly in heroic epic. But Odysseus doesn't turn to help; the poet states that he doesn't hear Diomedes but continues on to the ships (8.97-98), and no further mention is made of the issue.

By a rare phrasing (αὐτός περ ἑών 8.99) Diomedes is described as facing the Trojans alone, much as Nestor has been *left* alone. Yet the context matters, for the bravery that apparently attaches to Diomedes' lone stand is not the same type as is found with his offensive, manic *aristeia* (in book 5). Rather, he is here turning to help a comrade to escape from battle, for the other Achaeans have already fled. In rescuing Nestor with his horses, he notes how they know both how to pursue and to flee swiftly (8.104-5), and it is the latter that we expect them to undertake at this point. Diomedes, however, has other ideas, and decides to attack the Trojans head-on with Nestor, envisioning Hector coming to know how his spear rages (μαίνεται 8.109-11), which is no doubt meant to recall Diomedes' *mania* from book 5.

It is easy to lose track of where the narrative was going, for the battle is renewed. But lest we forget the flight of the Achaeans, Zeus perceives the situation and accordingly throws a lightning bolt immediately in front of the swift horses of Diomedes (8.130-35), as

though to return the story to its proper course.<sup>84</sup> Nestor, wise as is he is, understands the portent for what it is. Growing afraid, he exhorts Diomedes to flight (8.137-44), and the latter, for all his eagerness, eventually seems to comply, though Zeus must thrice more thunder in warning (8.167-71).<sup>85</sup>

As for the epithet οὔρος, I suggest that it is applied to Nestor here as a marker of the situation generally: the warriors are in flight, and must look out one for another. Ironically, it is the ‘guardian of the Achaeans’ who needs rescuing by Diomedes, and he returns the favor, as it were, by encouraging him to flight at the proper time, guarding the well-being of the army. This interpretation is reinforced by the next occurrence in the *Iliad* (11.840), where Patroclus is on a mission to deliver a message from Nestor, guardian of the Achaeans, but stops to help rescue his wounded comrade Eurypylus, which behavior is similar to the Diomedes-Nestor episode. And again, Nestor (15.370) is watching over the host as he leads the prayer to Zeus for salvation, where the context suggests protectiveness in time of distress.

If, then, the word is read in the Archilochus poem, I propose that it has something of an ironic meaning. On the face of it, he *is* acting as a guardian of his people, defending

---

<sup>84</sup> Fenik (1968) 220-22 discusses how untypical elements, such as Zeus hurling his lightning bolts, are prominent in this book, though the reversal of a battle through divine intervention is typical.

<sup>85</sup> Of course, it is not a total victory for the Trojans, for once the Achaeans are all returned to their ships, Hera intervenes to prevent their destruction by rousing Agamemnon (8.217-19).

Mysia from the attacking Achaeans.<sup>86</sup> If I am correct, however, that Archilochus is putting at least some emphasis on the flight of Telephus and his essential failure, then his role as guardian of his people is unfulfilled. The blame for this failure, as I have been suggesting, is owed to his decision to fight *alone* against the Achaeans.

In v. 25, there is an apparent reference to Telephus gratifying his father. It seems reasonable to assume the father is Heracles, not Telephus' adoptive father Teuthras.<sup>87</sup> Yet we should be cautious about taking the phrase at face value. In fr. 6 W we find the ironic expression:

ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυργρά χαριζόμενοι

“gratifying the enemy with guest-gifts of grief.”

There both ξείνια and χαριζόμενοι are not to be taken literally, and we find a similar phrase also in a martial context at 146.6 W: ξεινίων φειδοίατ[ο “they were sparing of guest-gifts.”<sup>88</sup>

In fr. 108 the speaker calls on Hephaestus:

κλῦθ' ἄναξ Ἥφαιστε, καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένωι

Ἰλαος γενέο, χαρίζεο δ' οἷά περ χαρίζεαι

“Hearken, Lord Hephaestus, and become my propitious ally as I implore you; grant me the sort of favors you grant.”

---

<sup>86</sup> See Engelmann and Merkelbach (1971) 97-103 on οὔροϛ (watcher), which is also Ionic for ὄροϛ (boundary), as originally ‘boundary-guard’. Cf. *Il.* 13.450 where Minos is called ἐπίουροϛ over Crete.

<sup>87</sup> Obbink (2005) 40.

<sup>88</sup> Lavelle (1981) 197-99 suggests that fr. 6 refers to a victory over ‘gift-taking’ Thracians, hence the ‘guest-gifts of grief.’ For the optative –οἶατο see West (1974) 106.

It is not clear just what sort of favor the poet thinks Hephaestus is particularly known for (cf. Hephaestus as fire, fr. 9.10-11 W), but one good possibility is that the poet is seeking a woman, given Hephaestus' role in fashioning Pandora (Hes. *Op.* 57-82). Possibly, then, *χαρίζεο δ' οἷά περ χαρίζεαι* is again ironic, for the favor, Pandora, is both gift and bane; we may think of the frustrating Lycambids, with whom Archilochus is nevertheless perpetually obsessed. I suggest that in v. 25 of the Telephus-fragment the poet is being ironic (though in a way practically the converse of fr. 6 W): Telephus obeys and hence gratifies the exhorting Heracles, but in doing so, by fighting alone, he also prepares for his own wounding, which of course will not please his father. In the same line, Telephus is described as fighting at close quarters (*ῥ]ρειδε*) with the enemy and as a *promachos*. We shall consider below the significance of the latter term, but the poet seems to specify again that Telephus is fighting on his own against the Danaans. Archilochus' audience is surely now anticipating the sequel, for why else has the poet drawn out the action as he does?

Yet if Telephus is made by Archilochus to serve as a negative example, as the warrior who fights without support of comrades, what do we make of the fate of the Achaean army in the poem as we have it? It has been suggested by P. Mayer that the Achaeans of the poem reflect the contemporary Thasians (or perhaps Parians) who are engaged in some struggle that the poet believes they should not be.<sup>89</sup> On this view, the mistaken landing at Mysia and the ensuing fighting is the corollary of a present conflict that has resulted in needless bloodshed and that should be broken off. Archilochus' poem would thus convey a dissuasive, political message, not unlike the elegies of Solon.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> Mayer (2006) 15-18.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Mayer (2006) 17.

Although I would not deny that Archilochus conveyed politically relevant messages in some of his poems, the scenario sketched by Mayer takes too literally the details of the poem that are really essential features of the tale. According to a summary of the story as it was told in the *Cypria*, the Greeks attacked Mysia in ignorance, believing it to be Troy: ἐν Τροίαν πλέοντες οἱ Ἕλληνες Μυσίαι προσίσχουσι, καὶ ἀγνοοῦντες αὐτὴν ἐπόρθουν, Τροίαν εἶναι νομίζοντες (Schol.Hom. A 59 = *Cypria* fr. 20 Bernabé). This summary matches quite closely the scenario described in the Archilochus version (vv. 16-21), so it would seem that the Achaeans' ignorance in making their attack on Mysia is a basic element of the myth.<sup>91</sup> It is of course possible that Archilochus found and selected the mythical exemplum that precisely matched the contemporary events he wished to comment upon, but this seems to me rather unlikely.

In addition, we have evidence of Archilochus using mythical allusion in what is probably a discussion of contemporary Thasian issues. Fragment 91 W survives in part from a quotation by Plutarch:

δέχεται δ' ὁ πολιτικὸς λόγος δικανικοῦ μᾶλλον καὶ γνωμολογίας καὶ ἱστορίας καὶ μύθους καὶ μεταφοράς, αἷς μάλιστα κινουῦσιν οἱ χρώμενοι μετρίως καὶ κατὰ καιρόν, ὥς... Ἀρχίλοχος, “μηδ' ὁ Ταντάλου λίθος / τῆσδ' ὑπὲρ νήσου κρεμάσθω” (Plut. *praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 803a).<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Indeed, the narrator of Philostratus' *Heroicus* objects to the account given by the poets (23.4) that the Achaeans landed at Mysia in ignorance (23.5-7); he reasons that they intentionally attacked for profit and to prevent an alliance with the Trojans (23.8).

<sup>92</sup> Translation by Gerber (1999a) 135.

“And political oratory, much more than that used in a court of law, admits maxims, historical and mythical tales, and metaphors, by means of which those who use them moderately and at the appropriate time move their audience exceedingly, as ... did Archilochus, “let the stone of Tantalus not hang over this island.””

But a papyrus-find (P. Lit. Lond. 55)<sup>93</sup> that includes the line-ends of the verses quoted by Plutarch (14-15) has helped to provide some context: the following line appears to end in a first-person plural verb ( ]μεθα 16 – the poet and his audience or fellow islanders?), and the beginning of line 44 ..] τα Θάσια[ suggests that the island in question at line 15 is Thasos. A wish also seems to be expressed (εἰ γὰρ v. 26). Although a coherent narrative cannot be gleaned from the scraps, it seems that the political circumstances (especially matters relating to warfare) of Thasos are being discussed.<sup>94</sup> From the appearances of this fragment, however, Archilochus makes an allusive, metaphorical reference to a mythical element.

Another parallel for the poet’s use of allegory is 105 W, cited by Heraclitus (*Alleg. Hom.* 5.2), who specifically states that the comparison has to do with fighting in Thrace: Ἀρχίλοχος μὲν ἐν τοῖς Θραιικοῖς ἀπειλημένος δεινοῖς τὸν πόλεμον εἰκάζει θαλαττίῳ κλύδωνι. The fragment reads:

Γλαῦχ’ ὄρα· βαθὺς γὰρ ἤδη κύμασιν ταρασσεται  
πόντος, ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄκρα Γυρέων ὀρθὸν ἵσταται νέφος,  
σῆμα χειμῶνος, κιχάνει δ’ ἐξ ἀελπίτης φόβος.

---

<sup>93</sup> P. Oxy. 2313 also contains fragments of lines 2-13.

<sup>94</sup> See Sider (2006) 332, who argues that *all* of the features of political oratory mentioned by Plutarch were included in the Archilochus poem from which he quotes.



“Glaucus, behold. For the deep sea is already stirred up with waves, and a cloud stands tall around the promontory of Gyrae, a sign of storm: fear arrives from the unexpected.”

J.S. Clay cogently argues that Heraclitus’ identification of this fragment as allegory rests upon mention of the mythical promontory of Gyrae (and not an actual place known to the poet).<sup>95</sup> This is the place where Ajax is killed by Poseidon for boasting that he escaped the sea against the will of the gods (*Od.* 4.499-511). Archilochus’ mention of storm and promontory both allude to the poet’s present circumstances in war.<sup>96</sup> I suggest, therefore, that there is no very literal correspondence between myth and contemporary situation in the Telephus-fragment, for this would be too artless and uncharacteristic of Archilochus’ style.

I propose instead that the mythical exemplum offered by Archilochus operates on a broader, more general level. This is not to say, however, that the message is not complex. In answer to the question I posed above, if Telephus serves as a negative example, then it is the Achaeans with whom the audience is meant to identify positively. The unified army, though facing a terrible setback and temporarily defeated, will fight again another day. The theme of the army hindered in their journey to Troy (v. 16) does not correspond to a mistaken or misguided attack by contemporary Thasians, but simply to a setback in war

---

<sup>95</sup> Clay (1982) 201-4.

<sup>96</sup> Fr. 213 W may also refer to men in a dangerous situation (in battle?) through allusive language: ψυχὰς ἔχοντες κυμάτων ἐν ἀγκάλαις “having their lives in the embrace of waves.” Pòrtulas (1982) 29-32 suggests that the language of a loving embrace is appropriated to describe violent grasping, which he takes to be a suitable metaphor for political turmoil.

experienced by Thasos. The correspondence between the myth and reality lies in the general theme of the variability of fortune and the dispensation of the gods. There is, however, one fault of the Achaeans that I think is highlighted: they believed (wrongly) that they were attacking Troy and would win a quick victory (cf. v. 21 ἀλ̣ψα).<sup>97</sup> The poet thus discourages over-confidence, particularly in matters of war. Despite this caution, the mythical example will end on a positive note for the Achaeans (and hence Archilochus' audience). Telephus will be wounded, and the better part of the army will be saved. Again, this does not fit exactly the contours of a contemporary battle: the Thasians have presumably just faced a defeat, a battle in which they were forced to flee. The end of the mythical exemplum is thus prospective – the Thasians, for their part, will (gods willing) have their day of victory yet, provided they remain a united force in combat. Let us now return to the fragment to see what support may be found for the interpretation I have sketched.

Lines 5-13 have largely been discussed above; they describe the defeat and flight of the army. The couplet (14-15) seems at first almost to be filler, for it is already clear who these routed Achaeans are. H. Bernsdorff proposes interpreting these lines as a reference to the impending destruction of the Achaeans (and indeed the whole race of demigods) upon reaching Troy.<sup>98</sup> In line with this view, he suggests the more pointed supplement μὀρος αἰνός for the end of verse 14.<sup>99</sup> While such an interpretation is intriguing, the sense

---

<sup>97</sup> Henry (2006) 14 suggests μά]ψ, to be taken with φ]άντο in 20, which would instead emphasize further the wrong-headedness of the Achaeans.

<sup>98</sup> Bernsdorff (2006) 1-7.

<sup>99</sup> Bernsdorff (2006) 6.

seems out of place in the poem, particularly given what follows. The future participle μαχησομένους (v. 15) is rather to be contrasted with the present setback of the Achaeans: οἱ δὲ τότε βλαφθέντες ὁδοῦ (v. 16). The Achaeans *should* be attacking Troy, and indeed that is what is fated for them to do. The participle thus reminds the audience that the Achaeans are not totally defeated on this occasion, and will go on to eventual victory.

Yet the supplement Ἀγαμέμνων (v. 14) seems a bit lacking in point. Somewhat differently from Bernsdorff's suggestion, we might try instead Διὸς αἵσα, already suggested by Livrea and reported in Obbink's second edition.<sup>100</sup> This reading would further underscore the role of fate and the gods in matters of war. 'Fate' here is not specifically the doom of death, but rather the sum of one's fortunes (both good and bad), one's allotted share. I suggested above that μοῖρα θεῶν (v. 7) is significant and points to the transience of Telephus' victory. A reference then to the subsequent destiny of the Achaeans would amplify this message: Telephus' good fortune will soon vanish, whereas success in war will eventually come to the Achaeans.

Twice in the *Iliad* the 'allotment of Zeus' refers to the proportion of the warrior's success in battle. Achilles refers to the (sufficient) honor he has attained by the allotment of Zeus (9.608), and the counterfactual prospect of the Achaeans winning battle glory *beyond* the allotment of Zeus is raised, but is of course rejected (17.319-23). If supplemented in verse 14 of the fragment, the phrase will also point to the fact that victory at Mysia is not allotted to the Achaeans. The losses they suffer there are in part owed to their mistaken assumption that it is Troy (v. 20), and their initial trust in a swift victory (v.

---

<sup>100</sup> Obbink (2006) 2 *ap. crit.*

21) is, I suggest, blameworthy. The message then seems to be: ‘be conservative, mind how swiftly fortunes change.’

But the Achaeans are not entirely to blame for the loss at Mysia. As the poet tells, they were on this occasion hindered from their course (v. 16) – perhaps by a storm or the designs of a god – but he does not specify. In all probability, however, the agency of the gods is in the poet’s mind; cf. *Od.* 1.195 θεοὶ βλάπτουσι κελεύθου (cited in the *ed. pr.*).<sup>101</sup> Several supplements have been proposed for the end of v. 16: παρὰ θ[ῖν] ἀφίκοντο ‘they had arrived at shore’;<sup>102</sup> θ[ῖνα μὲν ἦκον ‘they had come to shore’;<sup>103</sup> θ[ὶ] ὄρμον ἔλασσαν ‘they had overshot their mooring’<sup>104</sup>. As West points out, mention here of the Achaeans’ arrival at shore is pointless because the Achaeans would have similarly landed on shore at Troy, and so there is no contrast.<sup>105</sup> Nor, however, do we need to be told that they overshot their moorings (and the needed interpretation ‘*proper* moorings’ strains the language), for the poet already says they are off-course.

What precedes is key: the Achaeans are on their way to Troy, where they *will* do battle, as fated. At this time (τότε), however, they are making an attack on Mysia, but *in error*. I suggest παρὰ θ[υμὸν] ἔθεντο ‘they risked their lives’.<sup>106</sup> The participle

---

<sup>101</sup> See also Fraenkel (1950) ad *Ag.* 120 (the lemma λοισθίων δρόμων).

<sup>102</sup> Janko in Obbink (2005) 36; cf. Obbink (2006) 6.

<sup>103</sup> Luppe (2006) 3.

<sup>104</sup> West (2006) 14.

<sup>105</sup> West (2006) 14.

<sup>106</sup> Tmesis is remarkably common in Archilochus (thrice in the elegies alone); see West (1974) 108, cf. Obbink (2005) 36.

(παρθέμενοι) is so used in the *Odyssey*: the suitors risking their heads (2.237); of pirates risking their lives (ψυχάς, 3.74 = 9.255), all of which suggest an *unwarranted* risk. Yet Tyrtaeus makes it a positive characteristic of the soldier who bravely risks his life in battle: ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος (12.18 W).<sup>107</sup> And Archilochus has in a martial context μῆγαν ἔθεντο θυμὸν ‘they made their hearts great (i.e. roused their spirits)’ (98.16 W).<sup>108</sup> If my suggestion is read here, the phrase would be initially ambiguous: the Achaeans *bravely* risked their lives (the sense in Tyrtaeus), and they *foolishly* risked their lives. That the latter is the ‘true’ sense becomes clear in the poet’s manner of describing the action: in vain, without reason did they tread on wheat-bearing Mysia (v. 21). The participial phrase in the first half of 16 could then have a concessive sense: even though they are in the wrong place, the Achaeans are eager for battle. Note too how the result of their attack, θυμὸν ἀκηχέ[δατο (or ἀκηχέ[μενοι]<sup>109</sup> in line 19 would ‘echo’ the θυμὸν of v. 16: men with high spirits soon become grief-stricken. This supplement also mitigates the repetition of the

---

<sup>107</sup> It is not agreed whether the participle has the same meaning with both objects, “laying his life and stout heart on the line” (West [1993] 26), or different, “risking his life and displaying a steadfast spirit” (Gerber [1999b] 59). Given that we find both κεφαλὰς (*Od.* 2.237) and ψυχάς (*Od.* 3.74 = 9.255) as object, it is perhaps easier to assume it has the meaning ‘risk’ with both objects in Tyrtaeus.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. *Il* 9.629 ἄγριον ἐν στήθεσσι θέτο μεγάλτορα θυμὸν, where the sense seems to be both ‘place heart in breast’ and ‘make his heart savage’; [Hesiod] fr. 204.95–96 M-W πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμὸν ἔθεντο / ἐξ ἔριδος, where the gods set themselves at odds, in strife.

<sup>109</sup> West (2006) 14.

tale, for the poet does not really go back to the beginning of the episode (the arrival at shore) but supplements his initial narrative with key details.

ἀφρ[αδί]ηι in line 19 would also go to support the interpretation that the Achaeans attack in folly. Yet W.B. Henry points out that the spacing does not suit such a reading, and he proposes ἀ]μφ' Ε[λέν]ηι.<sup>110</sup> I do not, however, see the point of Helen here, unless it is heavily ironic (which, it is true, would not be inappropriate to Archilochus) – they suffered for Helen *or so they thought*. I propose reading ἀ]μφ' ὀ[δύν]ηι ‘with pain’, amplifying the distress and suffering of the Achaeans. Such a ‘full’ description of suffering is found in another of Archilochus’ elegies: οἶδαλέους δ’ ἀμφ’ ὀδύνης ἔχομεν / πνεύμονας (13.4-5 W).<sup>111</sup> The singular is thus found at A.R. 2.96, and, with different construction, at *Iliad* 11.398 and 15.25. Alternatively, sigma may easily be restored for the dative plural (the plural is far more common); at 13.4 W the singular is in fact read in Par. 1985.<sup>112</sup>

Supplementing 18-19 is difficult: West prefers the participle ἀκηχέ[μενοι in v. 19, which he makes depend along with 18 on the verb from v. 17 (with δριμύ tentatively in place of Janko’s ἐνθα in 18).<sup>113</sup> I am not so sure, however, about accepting αὐτο[ί τε καὶ ἵπποι (v. 18). The parallel ἵππος χαλινῶν ὥς κατασθμαίνων μένει (Aesch. *Sept.* 793) for the

---

<sup>110</sup> Henry (2006) 14.

<sup>111</sup> Where the pain felt is emotional, not physical. Both senses are perhaps meant in the Telephus-fragment: grief over loss of comrades and their failed, misguided assault, as well as physical distress from battle.

<sup>112</sup> Archilochus uses both the long and short form of the dative plural of alpha-stems; see West (1974) 93 and Slings (1983) 33-36 (whose analysis concludes the short form is an epicism).

<sup>113</sup> West (2006) 14.

fury-breathing horse is not so close, for the verb (panting) is different, as is the construction (with/out of fury). We might then try for a finite verb here instead, keeping ἔνθα, and reading rather ὁμως (nevertheless, v. 18) and the participle in v. 19 with West.<sup>114</sup> I have thought of αὐτοῖ[ς] περιδίδεισαν, yielding a line rather similar to *Il.* 11.508: τῶι ῥα περιδίδεισαν μένεα πνεύοντες Ἀχαιοὶ. The sense would thus be: ‘and they set upon the lovely city of Teuthras, where, breathing fury, nevertheless on the spot they became terrified, being greatly distressed at heart with pain.’ μένος again points at the unrestrained, frenzied eagerness of the Achaeans for battle, for which they immediately suffer defeat. Admittedly, περιδίδεισα always has lengthened iota in Homer (in observance of original digamma), but the practice of Archilochus is not certain.<sup>115</sup> Such a reading (along with ἀμφοῖ[ς] ὁ[δύν]ηι in place of ἀφροῖ[αδ]ήι in v. 19) would also remove the objection raised by West that the narrative is a bit confused here (i.e. that the Achaeans become sore at heart before they realize their mistake).<sup>116</sup> Rather, verses 16-19 together rapidly summarize the Achaean defeat: lost but eager for battle, they swiftly suffer. The explanation (γάρ) in vv. 20-21 refers to the situation as a whole, not just the Achaean suffering: why were they (a) eager to attack and (b) quickly routed? Because they thought it was Troy, but it was in fact

---

<sup>114</sup> Considered in the *editio princeps*: Obbink (2005) 37.

<sup>115</sup> See West (1974) 88, who notes Sem. 14.2 and Hi. 73.7 for a short syllable before δφ (not guaranteed by metre). Add now Archilochus 196a.39 (again not guaranteed by metre). For ἔνθα...αὐτοῦ cf. Solon 36.13 ἐνθάδ’ αὐτοῦ; *Il.* 8.207 αὐτοῦ κ’ ἔνθ’ where, however, ἔνθα is demonstrative not relative.

<sup>116</sup> West (2006) 14.

Mysia.<sup>117</sup> μ[ά]την (v. 21) then points to the fact that Mysia was not destined to be sacked then by the Achaeans.

There are thus several hints in our text that the *present* defeat at Mysia for the Achaeans and the corresponding victory of Telephus will be short-lived. To recapitulate: the dispensation of the gods puts the Achaeans to flight *for a time* (v. 7); clear mention of the *future* fighting to occur at Troy (possibly guided by divine authority, vv. 14-15); the emphasis that on *that occasion* they were off-course (v. 16); and, if [τ]ό[τε] is correct in v. 24, Telephus' rout of the Achaeans is again set in a particular, limited period of time.

We might also suppose that ἀπέκλινον of v. 12 is carefully chosen by Archilochus. It is not a very common word in general, and the intransitive use in a context of rout and flight is not found in epic. West refers to *h. Ven.* 168 as the closest parallel, but the verb is actually transitive there.<sup>118</sup> The best parallels for the sense at issue here are in fact from prose.<sup>119</sup> We find in Xenophon Κλέαρχος δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πολεμίους οὐκ ἤγεν· ... οὐ μέντοι οὐδὲ ἀπέκλινε, φυλαττόμενος μὴ δοκοίη φεύγειν (*An.* 2.2.16), and from Demosthenes οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ ῥαθυμεῖν ἀπέκλινεν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς Ὀλυνθίοις ἐπεχείρησεν (1.13). In both cases the verb suggests retreat (though rather metaphoric in the latter example) and is contrasted with making an attack. In Theocritus (ἀποκλίνας ἐπ' ἀριστερά, 7.130), however, it means 'turning, changing direction'. Of the Achaeans' flight, therefore, the sense is 'turning back headlong (to their ships).' The word suggests a forced 'course correction', which is

---

<sup>117</sup> Pace Nicolosi (2007) 315, γάρ does not introduce the explanation of their error – their error is the explanation of their eagerness for battle and resultant suffering.

<sup>118</sup> West (2006) 14; cf. Obbink (2005) 35.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Nicolosi (2007) 308-9.



contrasted then with v. 16 βλαφθέντες ὁδοῦ: ironically, their rout by Telephus puts them back on track to Troy, which is where they ought to be fighting.

It is true that Archilochus acknowledges the superiority of fate and the will of the gods over man. Yet the myth of Telephus is not introduced exclusively to underscore this fact, to demonstrate that flight is sometimes necessary. Rather, the myth also shows the reversal of fortunes, in particular how the great army of the Achaeans suffers a setback but goes on to victory. I have already noted above the instances in which the gods feature in Archilochus' battle narratives. More generally, however, the theme of the transience of fortunes and man's ignorance about the future occurs frequently in the fragments.

In the elegies, we find fortune and destiny giving all (both good and ill, as I take it) to mortals: πάντα Τύχη καὶ Μοῖρα, Περικλεες, ἀνδρὶ δίδωσιν (16 W).<sup>120</sup> Interestingly, fr. 17 W, a version of which is ascribed by John of Sicily to Archilochus, seems initially to convey precisely the opposite sense, that man's own hard work produces all: πάντα πόνος τεύχει θνητοῖς μελέτη τε βροτεΐη.<sup>121</sup> But the context in Syrianus, who quotes the fragment, also

---

<sup>120</sup> The single hexameter is not assigned with certainty to Archilochus, but the sentiment seems appropriate to the poet, and the address to Pericles supports the assignment (cf. fr. 13.1; 28.4 [?]; 124 [Ath. 1.7f]).

<sup>121</sup> The assignment of this verse to Archilochus is suspected because of the short scansion τε βρ, but see West (1974) 114.

suggests that it is the gods who ultimately provide, though man must work (i.6.8-14 Rabe).<sup>122</sup> And again, in consoling Pericles, the poet remarks:

... ἀλλὰ θεοὶ γὰρ ἀνηκέστοισι κακοῖσιν  
 ὦ φίλ' ἐπὶ κρατερὴν τλημοσύνην ἔθεσαν  
 φάρμακον. ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε· νῦν μὲν ἐς ἡμέας  
 ἐτράπεθ', αἱματόεν δ' ἔλκος ἀναστένομεν,  
 ἐξαῦτις δ' ἐτέρους ἐπαμείψεται. ἀλλὰ τάχιστα  
 τλῆτε, γυναικεῖον πένθος ἀπώσάμενοι (13.5-10 W).

"But the gods have set for incurable ills, my friend, mighty endurance as a medicine. Different men at different times have this (woe). Now it has turned upon us, and we bemoan a bloody wound, but it will again turn to others. But endure most swiftly, putting aside womanly lamentation!"

The reminder that suffering and sorrow are only temporary is meant to dispel grief over comrades lost at sea. In the Telephus-poem, Archilochus seems to provide similar consolation for a recent military loss – 'the gods were against us too today, but we must endure'. I have suggested that the mythical exemplum will end on a positive note for the audience: Telephus will be wounded and the Achaeans go on their way to Troy. A similar effect is produced at the end of 13 W.<sup>123</sup> The gentle words of consolation turn to a forceful

---

<sup>122</sup> Plato is also quoted for the notion that the gods trade men good things for their labors, and Ps.-Phocylides 162, a sentiment similar to Archilochus 17 W which it precedes, is introduced καὶ ἐν Μιλήτῳ ὁ θεός·.

<sup>123</sup> It has been suggested by e.g. Adkins (1985) 36 that 13 W is a complete poem; see also Faraone (2008) 17-19 for discussion.

command to cease from grief quickly. The gods do send woes, but they have also given the means to cope, which man must choose to exercise (note how τλῆτε refers back to τλημοσύνην). Just as the Achaeans manage to survive a setback, keep their forces together, and reach their true goal, so Archilochus' audience (his fighting comrades) must keep from becoming demoralized by their flight from battle.

Outside of his elegies, Archilochus treats at length the theme that anything may happen in fr. 122 W:

χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν ἐστιν οὐδ' ἀπώμοτον  
οὐδὲ θαυμάσιον, ἐπειδὴ Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυμπίων  
ἐκ μεσαμβρίας ἔθηκε νύκτ', ἀποκρύψας φάος  
ἡλίου †λάμποντος, λυγρόν† δ' ἦλθ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους δέος.  
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ καὶ πιστὰ πάντα κάπῑελπτα γίνεται  
ἀνδράσιν· μηδεὶς ἔθ' ὑμέων εἰσορέων θαυμαζέτω... (122.1-6 W).

"Nothing is unexpected or sworn impossible or a source of wonder, since Zeus father of Olympians made night out of mid-day, hiding the light of the sun, and fear came upon men. But after this everything is believable and expected for men; let none of you still wonder as you gaze..."

In the last lines of the fragment (7-9), even the 'impossible' scenario of dolphins switching their watery haunts with creatures of land is contemplated. Like the image of Zeus making night out of day, the poet imagines a change from the regular and expected to the unexpected. Aristotle cites the first line, and says that a father speaks about his daughter (*Rhet.* 3.17.1418b28). It is difficult to decide whether Aristotle means the father is speaking throughout or that he speaks at some point in the poem that begins thus.

Whichever is the case, the fragment we possess is probably not simply general musings by the poet, but remarks applicable to a particular situation. The message would be: although the present circumstances seem certainly thus, matters may still change. We may again have exhortation and the suggestion to beware how fortunes change.

Still more pointedly, the poet describes how man's fate – both good and bad – changes dramatically because of the gods:

τοῖς θεοῖς †τ' εἰθεῖάπαντα· πολλάκις μὲν ἐκ κακῶν  
 ἄνδρας ὀρθοῦσιν μελαίνῃ κειμένους ἐπὶ χθονί,  
 πολλάκις δ' ἀνατρέπουσι καὶ μάλ' εὖ βεβηκότας  
 ὑπτίους, κείνοις <δ'> ἔπειτα πολλὰ γίνεται κακά,  
 καὶ βίου χρήμη πλανᾶται καὶ νόου παρήγορος (130 W).<sup>124</sup>

"... Many times they set aright out of ills men who are lying on the dark earth, and many times they overturn on their backs even men who stand quite firm; for them then there are many ills, and he (such a man) wanders in need of livelihood, his mind distraught."

Once again, these sentiments are probably being expressed in the context of a particular situation – perhaps Archilochus is encouraging a friend that his bad fortune is bound to end, or warning a personal enemy that his luck will soon run out. It has been observed that many of our early poetic fragments survive in anthologists; fragments 13, 122, and 130 are all preserved by Stobaeus, who seems to have consciously selected passages that are

---

<sup>124</sup> The subject of the verbs in 2 and 3 must be the gods; see West (1974) 131-32 for discussion of the various emendations proposed for v. 1.

general and gnomic, perhaps even modifying the text to eliminate specific details.<sup>125</sup> It is likely, therefore, that many such fragments have been stripped of their original contexts, in which the gnome was adduced as but one means for the poet to deliver his message.

Where we can discern some context, as in 13 W, the underlying message is not that the gods are in control (though this is affirmed), but that present circumstances will change, which provides some hope and comfort. Archilochus seems to have this outlook as well in the new fragment, and he introduces the mythical exemplum in part to illustrate this point.

---

<sup>125</sup> See Campbell (1984) 51-57; Sider (2006) 329.

#### CHAPTER 4. THE IDEAL WARRIOR: STEADY AND RELIABLE

If in the new fragment Archilochus is encouraging his comrades that their fortunes in war will soon change, he is also providing guidance as to how the army must behave in order for them to attain future victory. I have already suggested that two models are presented in the Telephus-myth: Telephus, the negative example of a warrior who fights alone, and the Achaean army, which is consistently presented in the fragment as a unified group. In this last section, I will provide further evidence for the poet's ideas about the ideal warrior and the need for the fighting unit to remain cohesive. In addition, examples from epic will be adduced as a point of comparison for the ethos that Archilochus represents.

First, it should be said that there is some evidence that Archilochus engaged in military paraenesis, perhaps of the same sort found in Tyrtaeus and Callinus. Two fragments from the Sosthenes monument are suggestive:

ἴτω πᾶς ἐ]πὶ δυσμεν[έας  
 ἄλκιμον ἦτορ ἔχων καὶ ἀ]μείλιχον ἐν [φρεσὶ θυμόν,  
 ἀλ]εudάμενος (7 W).

“(let each man go) against the enemy, (having a brave heart and) implacable (spirit) in (his breast)...warding off.”

Peek understands a brief prose introduction before the next quotation:

πο[λλῶν δ' ἄθυμησάντων πάλιν λέ]γει· ἐξ ἐλάφων ν[ (7a W).<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> Peek (1985) 14 supplies ν[όον ἔσχετ' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ but the preposition is then hard to construe.

Perhaps then tmesis with a verb such as 'drive out (the spirit) of deer (from your breast)'; cf. West (1985) 9; Slings (1986) 2.

“(and when many lost heart again he says): from (?) deer.”

It seems likely enough that deer is a reference here to cowardice, for in fr. 280 W Archilochus is said to have called someone a deer because of his cowardice: παρ' ὦι (Ἀρχιλόχῳ) καί τις διὰ δειλίαν προσωνομάσθη πρόξ. 7a W is also probably from a war context because Sosthenes is primarily recording the military exploits of the poet. Slings objects to the identification of paraenesis in 7 W, suggesting instead that the poet narrates his own success in battle.<sup>127</sup> Indeed the fragments are scanty, but even supposing that prior exploits are described, we can still imagine the poet doing so in order to encourage his comrades. On the other hand, 3 W appears to show the poet looking forward to a coming fight in which close combat will be the norm:

οὔτοι πόλλ' ἐπὶ τόξα τανύσσεται, οὐδὲ θαμειαὶ  
 σφενδόναί, εὖτ' ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγηι  
 ἐν πεδίῳ· ξιφέων δὲ πολύστονον ἔσσεται ἔργον·  
 ταύτης γὰρ κεῖνοι δάμονές εἰσι μάχης  
 δεσπότης Εὐβοίης δουρκλυτοί.

“There certainly won’t be many bows stretched, nor will slings be frequent, whenever Ares brings together the moil of war on the plain, but there will be the grievous work of swords. For those spear-famed masters of Euboea are experts in that combat.”

Aside from the future tense, another hint that a real battle is being predicted is the pronoun κεῖνοι (v. 4), which suggests that the enemy is both real, immediate, and to be contrasted with an implied ‘we’.

---

<sup>127</sup> Slings (1986) 1-2.

In addition, a tetrameter fragment from the same inscription as fr. 7 and 7a W suggests a direct address to another party (a comrade?):

δ]έδοικας [το]ῖ ἀρι[τ]ε[ύ]σας πάρος

]δέδοικα[ς] (97a W).

“you’re afraid, (though previously) excellent at such things...you’re afraid.”

Taking this to be exhortation, we might understand a rhetorical question: ‘are you (really) afraid, when previously you were excellent?’ And, in an address to Glaucus (cf. fr. 15, 48.7, 105.1, 117, 131.1), we find evidence for the poet encouraging a named comrade:

Γλαῦκε, τίς σε θεῶν νό]ον

καὶ φρένας τρέψ[ας

γῆς ἐπιμνήσαιο τ[ῆ]σδε

δει]νὰ τολμήσας μεθ[

] ἦν εἶλες αἰχμῆι καὶ λ[

] σον {δ} ἔσκεν καὶ χαλ[ (96 W).

“(Glaucus, which of the gods) turning your mind and thoughts...may you think of this land...having endured dangers...which you at spear-point...and...was and”

The supplement of Glaucus’ name in v. 1 is secured by the prose account that names him in the Sosthenes inscription (A IVa 6). The poet seems to exhort Glaucus to remember the land (his homeland, Thasos, Paros?), and reminds him that he previously captured something by spear (the land again, a city, a woman?). In v. 4 we might take the aorist participle to refer also to Glaucus’ past actions; the supplement μεθ[’ ἡμέων (by Friedländer) I find very attractive, for Glaucus’ brave deeds would then be associated with his role as member of the group. Perhaps Glaucus has proposed abandoning the land



which they once captured, and Archilochus is encouraging him to defend it. We should note the possibility that the poet addresses a single comrade, but still in the context of the larger group. This would diminish Slings' objection (on 7 W) that paraenesis should be addressed only to the group (i.e. second or first person plural).<sup>128</sup>

For the poet's manner of addressing the group (not necessarily in martial exhortation), we may compare 13 W, where Pericles is addressed directly, but the first person plural (v. 4 ἔχομεν; v. 7 ἡμέας) is employed along with the second person (v. 10 τλήτε). In fr. 4 W, which is at least nominally set aboard ship during a watch (v. 6 νηός; v. 9 ἐν φυλακῇ) we find another combination of first and second person address:

οὔτ' ἐμοὶ ωσαῖ[  
 ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι θοῆς διὰ σέλματα νηὸς  
 φοίτα καὶ κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων,  
 ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς  
 νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῇ τῇδε δυνησόμεθα (4.5-9 W).

“nor for me...But keep going along the deck of the swift ship; yank away the lids of the hollow casks, and seize the red wine from the dregs. For we won't be able to stay sober on this watch.”

The first person singular pronoun in v. 5 is followed by several second person singular imperatives in vv. 6-8, but the poet switches to an emphatic (ἡμεῖς) first person plural in vv. 8-9.<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Slings (1986) 1.

<sup>129</sup> Bowie (2001) 66 notes how the poet's use of the first person plural aligns the performer with others from his city.

If it may be supposed that Archilochus was engaged in some of his poems in a type of military paraenesis, we must now ask what ideas he had about combat and the ideal fighter. Naturally, Archilochus does not provide explicit comments as to such matters, but some hints are to be found in the fragments. Perhaps most famous is Archilochus' opinion about the 'big general':

οὐ φιλέω μέγαν στρατηγὸν οὐδὲ διαπεπλιγμένον  
οὐδὲ βοστρύχοισι γαῦρον οὐδ' ὑπεξυρημένον,  
ἀλλὰ μοι μικρὸς τις εἴη καὶ περὶ κνήμας ἰδεῖν  
ῥοικός, ἀσφαλέως βεβηκὼς ποσσὶ, καρδίας πλέως (114 W).

"I am not fond of a general who is big or trots about proudly or exults in his locks or is partly shaved; but let me have a small one who looks bent around the shins, has a sure gait, full of heart."

We needn't dwell on the details, but the contrast is clear enough: Archilochus prefers a general who is steadfast, reliable, and not concerned with preening for attention. It seems reasonable to infer that the preference for a sure-footed and courageous general can be generalized to the average soldier as well. The sort of reliable warrior described here is also found in fr. 15 W:

Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχεται

"Glaucus, an ally remains your friend so long as he fights."<sup>130</sup>

This is not, I think, a bitter remark "that kinsman, ally, and boon companion might all prove cowards if life were at stake,"<sup>131</sup> for such a reading reverses the subject and predicate.

---

<sup>130</sup> Aristotle *Eth. Eudem.* 7.1236a35 calls the line a proverb, but it is assigned (probably safely) to Archilochus because of the address to Glaucus.

Rather, your comrade in arms is only truly a comrade (and therefore friend) if he fulfills his duty in combat. This is not a cynical statement, but reflects the simple reality that *when in battle* every man must do his part and satisfy the epithet ἐπίκουρος; the big general is thus no true comrade, and certainly no friend.

Finally, the poet's emphasis on fighting *together* (i.e. with ἐπίκουροι) may be inferred from fr. 259 W, from Aristides (*or.* 45, ii.137.17 Dindorf):

καὶ ὁ μὲν γε κατ' ἰσχὺν προφέρων, εἰ καὶ ἐνὸς εἴη κρείττων, ὑπὸ δυοῖν γ' ἂν αὐτὸν  
κατείργεσθαί φησι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος καὶ ἡ παροιμία.

"As to one who is outstanding in strength, even if he should be stronger than one,  
that he would at any rate be checked by two, both Archilochus and the proverb say."

The scholiast here (iii.429.17 Dindorf) reports that the proverb is οὐδε Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δύο, "not even Heracles against two," but he does not know the corresponding expression from Archilochus. It is quite possible that the proverb in fact originated with Archilochus.<sup>132</sup> Without knowing the context, we cannot be certain how Archilochus employed the expression. One possibility that has been suggested is that the two are the demanding daughters of Lycambes, though I do not find this particularly satisfying.<sup>133</sup> As Aristides indicates, physical strength is at issue, which most naturally suggests combat. The thought is that even the absolutely strongest individual can be bested by two who fight together.

---

<sup>131</sup> Burnett (1983) 44.

<sup>132</sup> West (1989) ad loc. notes that the proverb is expounded in two ways. The earliest attested version is from Plato, *Phaedo* 89c: πρὸς δύο λέγεται οὐδ' ὁ Ἡρακλῆς οἷός τε εἶναι; the second version reads οὐδὲ(ν) Ἡρακλῆς πρὸς δύο.

<sup>133</sup> West (1974) 138.

The idea that allies must fight together, that two can beat a single strong opponent, that a steady warrior is best, is a general one. If it were to be articulated in tactical terms, how might it appear? One answer might be found in the paraenesis of Tyrtaeus and Callinus, for example:

ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβὰς ἐν προμάχοισι μένηι  
 νωλεμέως, αἰσχρῆς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεται,  
 ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος,  
 θαρσύνῃ δ' ἔπεσιν τὸν πλησίον ἄνδρα παρεστώς· (Tyr. 12.16-19 W)

“The sort of man who stands firm among the foremost fighters without pause and is utterly unmindful of shameful flight, risking his life and daring spirit, and who speaks words of encouragement to his neighbor as he stands next to him”

Here the warrior who stands firm *among* the front ranks is praised; he is to risk his life, but as a member of the group. We find a still more specific implementation of this principle in the words of Nestor in the *Iliad*:

κρῖν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον,  
 ὥς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγηι, φύλα δὲ φύλοις.  
 εἰ δέ κεν ὥς ἔρξης καὶ τοι πείθωνται Ἀχαιοί,  
 γνώσε' ἔπειθ', ὅς θ' ἡγεμόνων κακὸς ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν,  
 ἦδ' ὅς κ' ἐσθλὸς ἔησι· κατὰ σφέας γὰρ μαχέονται.  
 γνώσεαι δ' εἰ καὶ θεσπεσίῃ πόλιν οὐκ ἀλαπάξεις,  
 ἧ ἄνδρῶν κακότητι καὶ ἀφραδίῃ πολέμοιο. (2.362-68).

“Divide the men into tribes, into phratries, Agamemnon, since phratry aids phratry, and tribe aids tribe. If you do this and the Achaeans then obey, you will know then

who among the leaders is a coward, and who among the people, and who is brave, since they will fight by themselves. You will know if you don't sack the city by divine will, or by the men's cowardice and senselessness in war."

Whatever the exact composition of tribes and phratries is, the idea is that members of the same group will feel encouraged to help one another (ἀρήγηι).<sup>134</sup> Like Archilochus' preferences for a general and his thoughts on the duty of a generic ally, the advice of Nestor is egalitarian in its application: Agamemnon will be able to see who is good and bad among the leaders and the masses alike. It is noteworthy that individual achievement (good fighter and bad) is to be evaluated in the context of group fighting. That is, excellence in war is determined by how well one fights with and aids one's comrades.

Such advice is reiterated by Nestor in a much-discussed passage from book 4. One recommendation he makes is to place the cowards in the middle so that they are compelled to fight (4.299-300). The principle, as I take it, is that every man, even the lousy fighters, counts; placed in the middle, they will not lead the course of the battle (either in advancing or retreating), but will fight with the group perforce.<sup>135</sup> Nestor then gives instructions for the charioteers:

ἵππεῦσιν μὲν πρῶτ' ἐπετέλλετο· τοὺς μὲν ἀνώγει  
σφοδρὺς ἵππους ἐχέμεν μηδὲ κλονέεσθαι ὁμίλῳ·

---

<sup>134</sup> Kirk (1985) ad 362-63 discusses some of the interpretations of these terms. The fact that they are almost without parallel in the *Iliad* suggests that they are designations of the poet's day (and not traditional), so perhaps the tactical advice is contemporary as well. See Raaflaub (2008) 477.

<sup>135</sup> Tyrtaeus fr. 9 W (Eustratius ad Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 3.8.5.1116a36) indicates that the poet describes the Lacedaemonians (in their fight against the Messenians) compelling the troops to fight.

“μηδέ τις ἵπποσύνηι τε καὶ ἡνορέηφι πεποιθώς  
 οἷος πρόσθ’ ἄλλων μεμάτω Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι,  
 μηδ’ ἀναχωρεῖτω· ἀλαπαδνότεροι γὰρ ἔσεσθε.  
 ὃς δέ κ’ ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ ὧν ὀχέων ἕτερ’ ἄρμαθ’ ἵκηται,  
 ἔγχει ὀρεξάσθω, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερον οὕτω.  
 ὧδε καὶ οἱ πρότεροι πόλιας καὶ τείχε’ ἐπόρθεον,  
 τόνδε νόον καὶ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔχοντες.” (4.301-9).

“He gave orders first to the charioteers: he encouraged them to check their horses and not to run rampant in the crowd; ‘Let none, trusting in his horsemanship and bravery, be eager to fight the Trojans alone, in front of the others, nor let him retreat, for you will be weaker. And whichever man reaches, from his own chariot, another chariot, let him attack with spear, since this is much better. In this way, previous generations too, having this mind and spirit in their breasts, sacked cities and walls.”

The advice given is unparalleled, and commentators offer various interpretations. Are the men to fight at close range from their chariots and only lunge (not throw) their spears? If so, this seems to be a rather poor strategy.<sup>136</sup> Perhaps, however, the charioteers are meant to remain as a unit (neither advancing nor retreating), and, when reaching the enemy chariots, dismount (ἀπὸ ὧν ὀχέων) and attack.<sup>137</sup> Indeed, the contrast Nestor appears to draw is between one who either draws ahead (and attacks alone) or withdraws (and does not attack), and one who, when reaching the enemy, attacks. The charioteers are meant to

---

<sup>136</sup> See Kirk (1985) ad 301-9.

<sup>137</sup> So van Wees (1994) 12-13.

do their fighting as a unit: if anyone breaks off – either to attack or retreat –, the *group* will be weaker (ἀλαπαδνότεροι γὰρ ἔσσεσθε).

It has been observed that there is a close correspondence between certain *Iliad* passages and fragments of martial elegy; West argues that the relationship is not one-way, and that the poet of the *Iliad* likely modeled some lines on elegiac poems (though not necessarily any we possess).<sup>138</sup> It has also been noticed that in Nestor's speech to the charioteers there is an unusual slip from narrative into direct speech.<sup>139</sup> Perhaps here we have an example of elegiac paraenesis adapted into hexameters. The advice is exceptional for the *Iliad*, and the direct address is jarring. The exhortation for each man to thrust his spear, for example, is reminiscent of Callinus fr. 1.9-11 W; that no charioteer is to advance or retreat, for such would weaken them all, is similar to Tyrtaeus fr. 11.11-13, where the soldiers are told to remain together since fewer will thus die. Whether we choose to posit conscious adaptation or not, the similarities at least indicate a general shared ethos.

Let us now consider the converse of the unified fighting group, the occasion on which an individual is left alone, particularly in a dangerous situation. We have already noted above some instances from the *Iliad* in which a fighter becomes isolated among the enemy and must be rescued by a comrade (Odysseus, rescued by Menelaus 11.456-71; Nestor, rescued by Diomedes, 8.79-171), and it is clearly a common motif.<sup>140</sup> One element that is emphasized is that the hero is *alone* and in trouble. This emphasis is significant because it must stand in contrast to those scenes in which a hero fights miraculously on his

---

<sup>138</sup> West (2011) 35-36

<sup>139</sup> Kirk (1985) ad 301-9.

<sup>140</sup> For the typical elements of these scenes, see the analysis of Fenik (1968) 58-60; 96-100; 221.

own and achieves astonishing feats; Callinus describes such a fighter (as a real figure) doing the deeds of many though alone: ἔρδει γὰρ πολλῶν ἄξια μοῦνος ἑών (1.21 W). A. Kahane examines the semantics of the terms *oios* and *mounos* and concludes that in Homer the former is marked and points to the narrator's amazement at the hero's extraordinary abilities, whereas the latter is unmarked and has broader application.<sup>141</sup> What this analysis suggests to me is that Homer was probably himself aware of the different connotations; a hero can be alone in two very different senses, and word choice can in part be a guide to sense.

The participle μονωθείς occurs only once in the *Iliad*, when Menelaus imagines Odysseus' dangerous situation (11.470-71; see above). It seems, then, to be a stronger term than μοῦνος, and I submit that it indicates something special about the poet's characterization of Menelaus – he is especially concerned for the well being of his comrades. The word occurs also in the *Odyssey* (15.386), and it there similarly shows the affection and protectiveness of the speaker. Odysseus is asking his faithful swineherd Eumaeus about his past, for the latter has just revealed that he was brought up by Odysseus' mother (15.361-70). Wondering at how young he must have been, Odysseus asks whether his home city had been sacked or if he had been taken by enemies while alone (μουνωθέντα) with his flocks (15.381-88). Such care and sympathy for one of his dependents shows that Odysseus is similar to the kind and sympathetic Menelaus of the *Iliad*.

Most strikingly, however, μοῦνος and the verb μουνόω are collocated in book 16 of the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus (in disguise) probes his son Telemachus. Upon hearing of the

---

<sup>141</sup> Kahane (1997) 118-35.



behavior of the suitors, Odysseus asks if Telemachus intentionally withstands this treatment, or if he is hated by the people, or is at odds with his brothers – *just the ones a man should trust in a fight* (16.91-98). He continues by wishing that he were one of Odysseus' sons, or Odysseus himself, so that he would then attack the suitors in his own halls, for even if he should be killed because fighting alone (μοῦνον ἐόντα), he would rather die than behold the outrages of the suitors (16.99-111). Odysseus thus tests Telemachus, to allow him in part to explain the situation, why he has endured the suitors for so long. In answer, Telemachus describes how he has had nobody else to depend upon:

ὥδε γὰρ ἡμετέρην γενεὴν μούνωσε Κρονίων·  
 μοῦνον Λαέρτην Ἀρκείσιος υἱὸν ἔτικτε,  
 μοῦνον δ' αὖτ' Ὀδυσῆα πατὴρ τέκεν· αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς  
 μοῦνον ἔμ' ἐν μεγάροισι τεκὼν λίπεν οὐδ' ἀπόνητο.  
 τὼ νῦν δυσμενέες μάλα μυρίοι εἴσ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ. (16.117-21).

“For the son of Cronus thus made our family solitary: Arceisius begat Laertes alone, and in turn Odysseus' father begat Odysseus alone, and then Odysseus begat and left me alone in his halls, nor did he have joy of me. So now there are countless enemies in his home.”

Here, Telemachus describes himself as alone in two, related ways: he was born an only child, and he was left alone by his father. He thus obliquely answers the tacit challenge of the disguised Odysseus, who claims to be willing to face the suitors alone: it would be futile for the lone Telemachus to attack the innumerable enemy. In context, we realize this is really Odysseus' opinion as well. His entire purpose at this point is to gain the support of Telemachus so that the two of them *together* can eventually face the suitors.

Although forms of μουνόω are markedly rare in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the verb in fact occurs in the fragments of Archilochus. In fr. 24 W the speaker addresses a friend who is returning from Gortyn. In the latter half of the fragment, it appears that the loss of cargo is contrasted with the speaker's fear that his friend be killed:

]ουσας· φ[ο]ρτίων δέ μοι μέ[λ]ει

]ος εἴτ' ἀπώλετο

]ν ἐστι μηχανή

δ' ἂν ἄλλ]λον οὔτιν' εὐροίμην ἐγώ

εἰ σ]ῆ κυμ' ἀλὸς κατέκλυσεν

ἦ ]ν χερσὶν αἰχμητέων ὑπο

ῆ]βην ἀγλ[α]ὴν ἀπ[ώ]λεσ[α]ς.

νῦν δ' ]θεῖ καί σε θε[ὸς ἐρ]ρύσατο

]..]. κάμῃ μουνωθέντ' ἰδ..

]ν, ἐν ζόφῳ δὲ κείμενο<ς>[

αὔτις ]έ[ς] φά[ος κ]ατεστάθην. (24.8-18 W).

"The cargo doesn't matter to me...whether it was destroyed...there is a way...but I would not find any other...if the wave of the sea had washed over you, or...you lost your splendid youth at the hands of spearmen...and a god has saved you...and me left alone...but lying in the gloom...I am set aright in the light."

In vv. 16 and 17 the speaker seems to draw attention to the suffering he experienced when his comrade was still away, his fate unknown. Perhaps some of this is exaggerated, but μουνωθέντ' seems to have the same force as it does in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* passages: it underscores the bond between comrades, though here the speaker elicits sympathy from

his friend for causing him such anxiety and heartache. The scene presented in this poem is not martial, but the fear expressed in vv. 13-14 is suggestive of such a context: while the speaker is left behind alone, his comrade has ventured out to face unknown perils without his friend, and one of the dangers that is imagined is an attack by enemy spearmen.

Archilochus emphasizes the solitariness of an individual in yet another type of poem, the fable:

ἐρέω τιν' ὕμιν αἶνον, ὦ Κηρυκίδη,  
 ἀχτυμένηι σκυτάλῃι,  
 πίθηκος ἦι θηρίων ἀποκριθεὶς  
 μούνος ἀν' ἐσχατιήν,  
 τῶι δ' ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλῇ συνήντετο,  
 πυκνὸν ἔχουσα νόον. (185 W).

"I'll tell you a certain tale, Cerycides (Herald-son), with grieving message stick (?)<sup>142</sup>;  
 a monkey was going, separated from the beasts, alone through the frontier, and a  
 clever fox with a shrewd mind met him."

The fable of the fox and the monkey is known from Aesop (*fab.* 81 Perry), who tells how the monkey, when elected king, provokes the anger of the fox, who lays a trap for the monkey. The beginning of Archilochus' version seems to be different, for the two animals meet right away. We cannot, of course, know to what purpose the poet told the fable, but the opening is suggestive. With three expressions (θηρίων ἀποκριθεὶς; μούνος; ἦι... ἀν' ἐσχατιήν), the poet emphasizes the isolation of the monkey. This, it seems, provides the opportunity for

---

<sup>142</sup> Perhaps the phrase is nominative (in apposition with the subject).

the fox to come upon him and prepare his trap.<sup>143</sup> Perhaps, then, one motive for telling the fable is to illustrate the folly of travelling alone.

In a clearly martial context (a tetrameter fragment from the Mnesiepes inscription, fr. 89 W), Archilochus describes a conflict between Thasians and Naxians. In line 4 θράσος ‘boldness’ is discernable, and in 5 οἱ μέγ’ ἱμείροντες ‘who desiring greatly’, whereas v. 8 reads ἄνδρες ἴσχουσιν ‘men check’. West tentatively proposes a scenario that makes sense of these and other scraps: “Daring and courage fill the νέοι, who long to get onto Naxos and destroy their orchards, but the older men restrain them?”<sup>144</sup> Two further elements from the fragment indicate that some such situation is being described: in two places ‘brothers’ are mentioned (v. 11 καὶ κασιγνήτων; v. 23 καὶ κασιγνή[τ]), which is perhaps a reference to kinsmen and their need to remain together;<sup>145</sup> we may compare the words of Odysseus, mentioned above, how one particularly relies upon *brothers* in combat (16.97-98). At v. 10 is read ὥς ἀμηνιτεῖ παρη[ ‘so that without wrath’; the hapax is interesting – might the poet be urging unity within the army?

Admittedly, such fragments can only provide glimpses, but with these in mind we may now return to the Telephus-poem to consider how he is presented by the poet. A. Aloni and A. Iannucci, in their study of the fragment, note how μοῦνος can be used in different senses, but they understand it in v. 5 as a reference to the superhuman ability of

---

<sup>143</sup> The trap is perhaps mentioned in fr. 186 W.

<sup>144</sup> West (1974) 126, who notes that the combination of future and present verb forms suggest the crisis continues.

<sup>145</sup> Line 19 οἱ μὲν ἐν Θάσῳι and 22 καὶ...ἐκ Πάρου suggest there may be contingents from each island represented in the fighting.

the hero to rout the Achaeans.<sup>146</sup> By contrast, the reading of πρόμαχος in v. 25 they take to be a reference to hoplite-style fighting in ranks.<sup>147</sup> As indicated above in the discussion of the origins of phalanx tactics, I too prefer such an interpretation of fighting in the front lines. Yet their discussion of the significance of πρόμαχος obscures a crucial fact: πρόμαχος does not occur in the singular in the *Iliad*.<sup>148</sup> The word of course occurs frequently, and typically with a preposition (with/among the foremost fighters). It appears too in elegy, though again never in the singular. The earliest example of the singular I have found is in Ibycus (298 *PMG*), where the poet is said to have called Heracles the πρόμαχος of Zeus. As already observed, Heracles is especially known for being a lone fighter, and he is not a model for real combat. Based on its usage, the word denotes fighting alongside comrades. For it to appear in the singular is practically a contradiction in terms. Its occurrence at v. 25 of the Telephus-fragment is thus marked and, I think, ironic. Telephus ought to be fighting with his Mysians, but he is not. μούνος (v. 5) makes the same point.

---

<sup>146</sup> Aloni and Iannucci (2007) 227-28.

<sup>147</sup> Aloni and Iannucci (2007) 228-30. They suggest that the two words function quite differently in the fragment, and they conclude that we in fact have two separate poems – one referring to the flight of the Achaeans as justification for a recent rout and the other celebrating the πρόμαχος and Heracles as city founder (230-36). I cannot follow either scenario they suggest for how the two poems became fused (236).

<sup>148</sup> There is however a Boeotian fighter named Promachus at *Il.* 14.476; the name may be an ad hoc invention, see Janko (1992) ad 475-78 and West (2011) ad 476. He is killed by Acamas in retaliation for the killing of his brother (14.476-85).

The related verb προμάχομαι occurs twice in the *Iliad*. The first instance is after a rally of the Trojans, when the armies are prepared to reengage. Agamemnon, the poet tells, wished to fight far ahead of all: ἔθελεν δὲ πολὺ προμάχεσθαι ἀπάντων (11.217). This line initiates the *aristeia* of Agamemnon. Here, the emphasis is upon the solo exploits of one of the heroes. This is the traditional presentation of a hero, fundamental to heroic epic. It is not, however, the only manner of presenting the hero. The other occurrence of the verb is from book 17, the struggle over Patroclus. Ajax orchestrates the protection of the corpse, as the Achaeans are surrounded by Trojans:

Αἴας γὰρ μάλα πάντας ἐπώιχετο πολλὰ κελεύων·  
οὔτε τιν' ἐξοπίσω νεκροῦ χάζεσθαι ἀνώγει  
οὔτε τινα προμάχεσθαι Ἀχαιῶν ἔξοχον ἄλλων,  
ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἀμφ' αὐτῷι βεβήμεν, σχεδόθεν τε μάχεσθαι. (17.356-59).

“Ajax went among all the men, giving many orders: he urged that none withdraw behind the corpse, and that none fight well in front of the other Achaeans, but to remain quite firm around it and to fight at close quarters.”

The orders Ajax gives are quite reminiscent of Nestor's tactics from book 4.<sup>149</sup> Note too that the Achaeans are essentially still πρόμαχοι, warding off the attacking Trojans. What Ajax discourages is a single fighter standing out from the rest (ἔξοχον ἄλλων), which is what Agamemnon does in book 11. Also significant is that the Achaeans are on the

---

<sup>149</sup> And cf. 17.469-73, where Alcimedon chastises Automedon for attempting to fight alone in his chariot against the Trojans in the front of the throng (οἷον πρὸς Τρῳᾶς μάχεται πρώτῳ ἐν ὁμίλῳ / μοῦνος, ἀτὰρ τοι ἑταῖρος ἀπέκτατο 17.471-72).

defensive, protecting the fallen Patroclus. This behavior is motivated by the same sense of camaraderie that inspires a fighter to come to the rescue of an isolated friend.

We have already observed how frequently Menelaus is the recipient of such aid and protectiveness. In book 17 we find Menelaus returning, as it were, the favor. The title given to this book in the manuscripts is *Μενελάου ἀριστεία*. Modern scholars call this a misnomer, but who are we to judge?<sup>150</sup> Let us try to make sense of this title. The struggle for the corpse is quite drawn out, but we may focus upon two episodes. Early in the action Hector rouses the Trojans after Menelaus has killed several men. Menelaus addresses a remarkable speech to himself in which he contemplates whether to flee or to remain with the body (91-105).<sup>151</sup> He decides, in fact, to retreat:

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;  
 ὅππότε' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλῃ πρὸς δαίμονα φωτὶ μάχεσθαι  
 ὃν κε θεὸς τιμᾷ, τάχα οἱ μέγα πῆμα κυλίσθη.  
 τὼ μ' οὔ τις Δαναῶν νεμεσῆσεται, ὅς κεν ἴδῃται  
 Ἕκτορι χωρήσαντ', ἐπεὶ ἐκ θεόφιν πολεμίζει. (97-101).

"But why is my heart debating this? Whenever someone wishes contrary to a divinity to fight a man whom god honors, quickly he is embroiled in great trouble. So none of the Danaans, whoever sees me retreating before Hector, will grudge me, since he is fighting with divine favor."

His plan, however, is to get reinforcements: he retreats before Hector, but he turns around and stands firm when he reaches his companions (*ἔθνος ἐταίρων*), and looks about for

---

<sup>150</sup> E.g. West (2011) ad 17.1-8.

<sup>151</sup> See Fenik (1968) 96-98 for parallel speeches, none of which conclude with flight.

Telamonian Ajax (114-15). He rouses Ajax to help him recover the body, and the two return to continue the struggle (120-24). Menelaus' speech and behavior are revealing of his character: he realizes that however much he wishes to remain by Patroclus, he cannot oppose a divinely supported enemy, and his solution is to get the help of his comrade. This is much the same sentiment we have observed in Archilochus. After further struggle, the scene is repeated, for Ajax decides that even the two of them are insufficient (238-45). So Menelaus calls out for more help; the poet names Oilean Ajax, Idomeneus, and Meriones, but claims that no man could list all the fighters who then came to help (248-61). We note again the support that Menelaus (and Patroclus) can inspire.

Yet again in book 17 the combat goes poorly for the Achaeans, and Athena descends in the guise of Phoenix to inspire the troops. She first addresses Menelaus, and in response he makes a wish that Athena would give him strength (17.561-66). This, naturally, delights Athena, so she provides the resolve he has requested:

έν δὲ βίην ὤμοισι καὶ έν γούνεσσιν ἔθηκεν,  
 καὶ οἱ μυίης θάρσος ένὶ στήθεσσιν ένῆκεν,  
 ἥ τε καὶ έργομένη μάλα περ χροδς άνδρομέοιο  
 ίχανάαι δακέειν· λαρόν τέ οἱ αἶμ' άνθρώπου· (17.569-72).<sup>152</sup>

"She put force into his shoulders and knees, and she placed in his breast the courage of a fly, which, though forcefully shooed away, desires human flesh, to bite it; the blood of man tastes sweet to it."

---

<sup>152</sup> West reads ίχανάαι, 'desires', to be taken with the preceding genitive, but Edwards (1991) ad 570-73 reasonably defends ίσχανάαι and translates: "...which, though vigorously (μάλα) kept away from a man's flesh, persists in biting, for human blood is sweet to her."



The comparison with a fly is unusual but vivid. Indeed, Menelaus goes and stands firm over Patroclus (17.574); even though he is not the best fighter, his dedication is admirable.

In a private context, the same persistence displayed by Menelaus seems to be claimed by Archilochus. The speaker of 23 W addresses a woman, and he appears to defend himself against a charge that he has conducted himself poorly and contrary to his usual noble nature (23.11-13). The speaker protests:

ἐπ[ίσταμαί τοι τὸν φιλ[έο]ν[τα] μὲν φ[ι]λεῖν[,  
τὸ]ν δ' ἐχθρὸν ἐχθαίρειν τε [κα]ὶ κακο[  
μύ]ρμηξ. λόγῳ γυν τ[ῶιδ' ἀλη]θείη πάρ[α. (23.14-16).<sup>153</sup>

“I indeed know how both to show affection to my friend and to show enmity and ill-  
(...) to my enemy – as an ant. Now there is truth in this speech.”

The ant has not, to my knowledge, been adequately explained. The ancients often noted the sociability of the ant, but this cannot be the only point of comparison here because Archilochus elaborates on his behavior toward his enemies.<sup>154</sup> Davies and Kathirithamby

---

<sup>153</sup> Various supplements are proposed for the end of v. 15: see West's (1989) ap. crit. and Slings (1982) 69-70 and (1983) 31-32. Without certainty on the reading in 15, I assume that the ant of v. 16 stands in apposition with the subject. For the idea of treating an enemy ill in return, cf. Archilochus 126 W. See Blundell (1989) 26-59, esp. 57-59, where she observes that 'harm enemies' is descriptive (for this is really a natural impulse), whereas 'help friends' is prescriptive and essential for the maintenance of social cohesion.

<sup>154</sup> On sociability, see Beavis (1988) 204-5; Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 38-42. Morel (1971) 143-44 suggests the ant is not aggressive toward other ants; as Slings (1982) 70 points out, the

suggest the emphasis is upon the enmity: “‘even an ant has venom’,” and they note the corresponding English proverb: “‘the fly has spleen, the ant gall’.”<sup>155</sup> The correlation of fly and ant in this regard in English is interesting, and perhaps the comparison with a diminutive insect is appropriate for both Archilochus and Menelaus (who is typically presented as a second rate warrior), but we must still account for the ‘help friends’ aspect. I suggest that the point of comparison is essentially the dogged consistency of the ant; the notion of both sociability and venomousness are likely present too, but secondarily.<sup>156</sup> The speaker defends himself against an accusation of being unlike himself: he retorts that he is remarkably consistent – he is both dedicated friend and enemy, never relenting on either front. Menelaus as fly is a similar comparison because in context he is both helping his friend (defending the corpse of Patroclus) and harming his enemies (the Trojans). The blood of the enemy is sweet (i.e. Menelaus craves revenge), and the fly, like the tireless ant, is unrelenting in its mission.<sup>157</sup> Archilochus the ant is thus similar to Menelaus the determined fly. Archilochus’ enemy is personal, not a combatant, but the principle is essentially the same.

---

comparison should be threefold, so we must also understand the violence of the ant towards non-ants (he call the comparison “not strikingly apt”).

<sup>155</sup> Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 44, though Slings (1982) 70 doubts this is at issue.

<sup>156</sup> The observation of the ant’s tireless industry was often made in antiquity – see Beavis (1988) 203-4.

<sup>157</sup> See Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 7-8.

Let us now consider an unattributed iambic fragment (38 W). I indicated above the possibility that it belongs to Archilochus. The text provided here incorporates some of West's more tentative supplements *exempli gratia*:

..ε.[.]ποιεῖ[.]υπαντων[  
 .].νος' . (.)δ[.]οιμε....[  
 .... ] ἐπικροτέων[  
 ..]εβαμβάλυζε· πολλ[ἀ  
 καὶ τὸ μὲν φυγεῖν ὅταν δῇ[χρεώ τις, οἷα καὶ τότε  
 ἀνδράσιν κείνοις χολωθεί[ς θεὸς ἐπώτρυνε στρατόν  
 δυσμενέων κομῆτα παίδ[ων,  
 οὗ σε τοῦτ' ἥισχυνεν οὐδὲ ν[έμεσις ἐστίν, ἀσπίδα  
 ὥς ἀπ' εὐεργέα τινάξας ἐτρ[άπης  
 καὶ γὰρ ἀλκιμωτέρους σέο κατα[λαβόντα δείματα  
 ταῦτ' ἐπηβόλη[σ]ε· θεοὺς γὰρ οὐκ ἐνίκ[ησεν βροτός·  
 ἀλλ' ὀτεύνεκεν πρὸ πάντων ἐκ[λιπὼν στρατηῖν  
 ἦλθες ἐκπλ[...].ς ἐφ' ὕγρὰ κύματ['] εὐρέης ἀλός  
 ἀδρυφής, οὐ[...].γσε[.....]εκλει[  
 ἀλλαπαρθε[.....]δεμ[.  
 .].π]όλιν π[.....]ναγν[ (adesp. iamb. 38.1-16).<sup>158</sup>

“making (?)...all...chattering...he shivered; many...and as for flight, when (there is some necessity, as on that occasion,) angered with those men, (the god roused against them the army) of the enemy, long-haired boy...this did not bring shame on

<sup>158</sup> I omit the last two lines of the fragment.

you, nor (is there resentment) that you shook off your well-made (shield) and turn(ed in flight), for braver men than you have been (overtaken) and mastered by these (panics,) for (a mortal) cannot beat the gods. But because before all...you (sailing?) over the watery waves of the broad sea came without being torn up...city.”<sup>159</sup>

Despite the poor state of the fragment, the thought in vv. 8-9, that flight did not shame the addressee, seems clear enough. The expression in v. 11 is suitable for Archilochus, and the presence of the gods there supports West’s supplement in v. 6 that the gods were aiding the enemy. Yet the speaker appears to draw a contrast in v. 12 – something *has* brought shame to the long-haired boy. There may be a crucial detail in v. 12 πρὸ πάντων, which perhaps is related to πάντων in v. 1: the boy has travelled somewhere over the sea, apparently without being injured (the hapax ἀδρυφής), whereas all the others seem to have a different fate. I propose that what the speaker may be referring to is the boy’s abandonment of his fellow soldiers. The distinction is between a mass rout in a battle and desertion from the army’s camp – the boy sailed away over the sea. The behavior of the boy seems to be contrasted with that of all the rest – he was acting *alone*.

I offered above a scenario as background to fr. 5 W to explain the poet’s statement that he did not wish to leave his shield and flee (οὐκ ἐθέλων): he was compelled to do so because one of his supposed ἐπίκουποι broke ranks and fled. There was no general flight, but Archilochus’ comrade left him alone. In such a situation, he made the same calculation that Menelaus does at Patroclus’ corpse, and realized he had to flee in order to save his life. The alternative was certain death, and his safe return becomes a source of joy for his

---

<sup>159</sup>Translation after West (2006) 12 and Gerber (1999a) 541.

comrades, for he is indeed a loyal friend. Such a scenario, if highly speculative, suits the poet's warrior ethos as I have tried to define it.

Let us conclude with an example of the poet's courage. In fr. 128 W the poet addresses his own heart with an exhortatory speech:

θυμέ, θύμ', ἀμηχάνοισι κήδεσιν κυκώμενε,  
 †ἀναδευ δυσμενῶν† δ' ἀλέξεο προσβαλὼν ἐναντίον  
 στέρνον †ένδοκοισιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεὶς  
 ἀσφαλέως· καὶ μήτε νικέων ἀμφάδην ἀγάλλεο,  
 μηδὲ νικηθεὶς ἐν οἴκῳ καταπεσὼν ὀδύρεο,  
 ἀλλὰ χαρτοῖσιν τε χαῖρε καὶ κακοῖσιν ἀσχάλα  
 μὴ λίην, γίνωσκε δ' οἷος ῥυσμὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχει.

"My heart, my heart, embroiled in unmanageable troubles, rise up (?), defend yourself by placing your breast opposite the foes (?), as you stand steadfastly near the ambushes (?) of your enemies. And neither delight excessively in victory, nor, when conquered, fall down and lament at home, but rejoice at your joys and grieve at your woes in moderation. Recognize the sort of rhythm that holds men."

We find here a mixture of martial and personal themes: the exhortation to stand fast is combined with acknowledgement of personal cares (κήδεσιν), and perhaps enemy combatants (δυσμενῶν?) with personal enemies (ἐχθρῶν). For the poet, these categories seem to overlap, and the same principle of loyalty and comradeship is applicable to both. Just as the poet realizes how victory in battle rests with the gods (111 W), the pattern of human life shows that successes are always mingled with defeat. The best policy,

Archilochus knows, is to be moderate and constant, and this is the recommendation he makes to his fellows.

## REFERENCES

- Adkins, A.W.H. (1985). *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aloni, A., Iannucci, A. (2007). *L'elegia greca e l'epigramma dalle origini al V secolo. Con un'appendice sulla 'nuova' elegia de Archiloco*. Florence: Le Monnier Università.
- Anderson, C. A. (2008). "Archilochus, His Lost Shield, and the Heroic Ideal." *Phoenix* 62: 255-60.
- Anderson, J.K. (1991). "Hoplite Weapons and Offensive Arms." in: V.D. Hanson, ed. *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*. (London and New York: Routledge): 15-37.
- Barker, E.T.E. and J.P. Christensen (2006). "Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and its Resonance with Homeric Epic." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 57: 9-41.
- Beavis, I.C. (1988). *Insects and Other Invertebrates in Classical Antiquity*. Exeter: University Publications.
- Bergren, A.L.T. (1975). *The Etymology and Usage of ΠΕΙΡΑΠ in Early Greek Poetry: A Study in the Interrelationship of Metrics, Linguistics and Poetics, American Classical Studies* 2. State College, PA: The American Philological Association.
- Bernsdorff, H. (2006). "Halbgötter auf der Flucht – Zu P. Oxy. 4708 (Archilochos?)." *ZPE* 158: 1-7.
- Blundell, M.W. (1989). *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boardman, J. (1983). "Symbol and Story in Geometric Art" in: W.G. Moon, ed. *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press): 15-36.

- Bowie, E.L. (1986). "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium, and Public Festival." *JHS* 106: 13-35.
- (1990). "Miles Ludens? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy." in: O. Murray, ed. *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press): 221-29.
- (2001). "Ancestors of Historiography in Early Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poetry" in: N. Luraghi, ed. *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 45-66.
- Brown, C.G. (1997). "Iambos." in: D.E. Gerber, ed. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. *Mnemosyne Supp.* 173 (Leiden: Brill): 11-88.
- Burnett, A.P. (1983). *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Campbell, D.A. (1984). "Stobaeus and Early Greek Lyric Poetry." in: D.E. Gerber, ed. *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of Leonard Woodbury*. (Chico, CA: Scholars Press): 51-57.
- Carey, C. (2011). "Alcman: From Laconia to Alexandria." in: L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie, eds. *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination. Trends in Classics – Suppl. Vols.*, 10. (Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter): 437-60.
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1978). *Philip of Macedon*. London.
- (1989). "Orthodoxy and Hoplites." *CQ* 39: 375-89.
- Clay, J.S. (1982). "Akra Gurewn: Geography, Allegory, and Allusion (Archilochus Fragment 105 West)." *AJP* 103: 201-4.
- Collard, C. (1975). *Euripides Supplices: Vol II Commentary*. Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis.
- Davies, M. and Kathirithamby, J. (1986). *Greek Insects*. London: Duckworth.



- Donlan, W. (1970). "Archilochus, Strabo, and the Lelantine War." *TAPA* 101: 131-42.
- Dover, K. (1963). "The Poetry of Archilochus" in: *Archiloque. Fondation Hardt, Entretients sur l'antiquité classique, Tome X*. (Genève: Vandoeuvres): 181-222.
- Edwards, M.W. (1991). *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume V: books 17-20*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Engelmann, H. and Merkelbach, R. (1971). "οὔρος, ὄρος." *ZPE* 8: 97-103.
- Faraone, C.A. (2008). *The Stanzaic Architecture of Early Greek Elegy*. Oxford: University Press.
- Fenik, B. (1968). *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description. Hermes Einzelschriften 21*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Fraenkel, E. (1950). *Aeschylus: Agamemnon, Vol. II Commentary on 1-1055*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gantz, T. (1993). *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gerber, D.E. (1970). *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- (1997). "Elegy." in: D.E. Gerber, ed. *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets. Mnemosyne Supp.* 173 (Leiden: Brill): 89-132.
- (1999a). *Greek Iambic Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- (1999b). *Greek Elegiac Poetry*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hainsworth, B. (1993). *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume III: books 9-12*. Cambridge: University Press.

- Hanson, V.D. (1991). "Hoplite Technology in Phalanx Battle." in: V.D. Hanson, ed. *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience*. (London and New York: Routledge): 63-84.
- Henry, W.B. (2006). "Archilochus, P. Oxy. 4708 fr. 1.18-21." *ZPE*: 14.
- Hirschberger, M. (2004). *Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 198*. München: K.G. Saur.
- Holladay, A.J. (1982). "Hoplites and Heresies." *JHS* 102: 94-103.
- Janko, R. (1992). *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume IV: books 13-16*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Jaeger, W. (1939). *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. I*. G. Highet, transl. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kahane, A. (1997). "Hexameter Progression and the Homeric Hero's Solitary State." in: E. Bakker and A. Kahane, eds. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press): 110-37.
- Katsonopoulou, D. (2008). "Telephos Arkasides in a New Poem of Archilochos" in: D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos, S. Katsarou, eds. *Archilochos and his Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, Paroikia, Paros, 7-9 October 2005*. Athens.
- Kirk, G.S. (1985). *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: books 1-4*. Cambridge: University Press.
- (1990). *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume II: books 5-8*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Kivilo, M. (2010). *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition. Mnemosyne Supp.* 322. Leiden: Brill.

- Kowerski, L.M. (2005). *Simonides on the Persian Wars: A Study of the Elegiac Verses of the "New Simonides."* New York and London: Routledge.
- Krentz, P. (2002). "Fighting by the Rules: The Invention of the Hoplite Agôn." *Hesperia* 71: 23-39.
- (2010). *The Battle of Marathon*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Langdon, S. (2008). *Art and Identity in Dark Age Greece, 1100-700 B.C.E.* Cambridge: University Press.
- Latacz, J. (1977). *Kampfparänese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*. *Zetemata* 66. Munich.
- Lavelle, B.M. (1981). "Archilochos Fr. 6 West and ΕΙΝΙΑ." *CJ* 76: 197-99.
- (2008) "The Servant of Enyalios" in: D. Katsonopoulou, I. Petropoulos, S. Katsarou, eds. *Archilochos and his Age: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, Paroikia, Paros, 7-9 October 2005*. Athens.
- Lorimer, H.L. (1947). "The Hoplite Phalanx with Special Reference to the Poems of Archilochus and Tyrtaeus." *ABSA* 42: 76-138.
- Luppe, W. (2006). "Zum Neuen Archilochos (P. Oxy 4708)." *ZPE* 155: 1-4.
- Magnelli, E. (2006). "On the New Fragments of Greek Poetry from Oxyrhynchus." *ZPE* 158: 9-12.
- Mayer, P. (2006). "Krieg aus Versehen? Zur Funktion und Aussage der Telephos-Geschichte im neuen Archilochos (P. Oxy. 4708, fr. 1)." *ZPE* 161: 15-18.
- Morel, W. (1971). "Die Ameise bei Archilochos." *ZPE* 8: 143-44.
- Most, G. (2007). *Hesiod: The Shield, Catalogue of Women, Other Fragments*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

- Nicolosi, A. (2007). *Ipponatte, Epodi di Strasburgo, Archiloco, Epodi di Colonia (Con un'Appendice su P. Oxy. LXIX 4708)*. Eikasmos 14. Bologna: Patròn Editore.
- Obbink, D. (2005). "4708. Archilochus, Elegies (More of VI 854 and XXX 2507)." in: *The Oxyrynchus Papyri*, Vol. 69: 18-42.
- (2006). "A New Archilochus Poem." *ZPE* 156: 1-9.
- Page, D. (1963). "Archilochus and the Oral Tradition" in: *Archiloque. Fondation Hardt, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, Tome X*. (Genève: Vandoeuvres): 117-79.
- Peek, W. (1985). "Ein neues Bruchstück vom Archilochos-Monument des Sosthenes." *ZPE* 59: 13-22.
- Pòrtulas, J. (1982). "Archilochus, Fr. 213 West = 21 Tarditi." *QUCC* 11: 29-32.
- Preisner, C. (2000). *Euripides, Telephos: Einleitung, Text, Kommentar. Spudasmata 78*. Zürich and New York: Georg Olms.
- Raaflaub, K. (2008). "Homeric Warriors and Battles: Trying to Resolve Old Problems." *CW* 101: 469-83.
- Rankin, H.D. (1977). *Archilochus of Paros*. Park Ridge: Noyes Press.
- Richardson, S. (1990). *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Schwartz, A. (2002). "The Early Hoplite Phalanx: Order or Disarray?" *Classica et Mediaevalia* 53: 31-64.
- (2009). *Reinstating the Hoplite: Arms, Armour, and Phalanx Fighting in Archaic and Classical Greece. Historia Einzelschriften 207*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Schwertfeger, T. (1982). "Der Schild des Archilochos." *Chiron* 12: 253-80.
- Sider, D. (2006). "The New Simonides and the Question of Historical Elegy." *AJP* 127: 327-46.

- Slings, S. (1982). "Archilochus and the Ant." *ZPE* 45: 69-70.
- (1983). "Once More Archilochus and the Ant." *ZPE* 53: 31-36.
- (1986). "Archilochus: New Fragments from the Sosthenes Inscription." *ZPE* 63: 1-3.
- Snodgrass, A.M. (1964). *Early Greek Armour and Weapons*. Edinburgh: University Press.
- (1993). "The 'Hoplite Reform' Revisited." *DHA* 19: 47-61.
- (1999<sup>2</sup>). *Arms and Armour of the Greeks*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Van Wees, H. (1986). "Leaders of Men? Military Organisation in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 36: 285-303.
- (1988). "Kings in Combat: Battles and Heroes in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 38: 1-24.
- (1994). "The Homeric Way of War: The *Iliad* and the Hoplite Phalanx (I)." *G&R* 41: 1-18 = in: I. J.F. de Jong, ed. *Homer: Critical Assessments, Volume II The Homeric World* (London and New York: Routledge): 221-38.
- (2000). "The Development of the Hoplite Phalanx: Iconography and reality in the seventh century." in: H. van Wees, ed. *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*. (London: Duckworth): 125-66.
- (2004). *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- West, M.L. (1966). *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: University Press.
- (1974). *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- (1985). "Archilochus: New Fragments and Readings." *ZPE* 61: 8-13.
- (1989). *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati. Editio Altera, Vol. I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1992). *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati. Editio Altera, Vol. II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- , (1993). *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford: University Press.
- , (1995). "The Date of the *Iliad*." *MH* 52: 203-19.
- , (2006). "Archilochus and Telephos." *ZPE* 156: 11-17.
- , (2011). *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. Oxford: University press.
- Willcock, M. (2002). "Menelaos in the *Iliad*." in: M. Reichel and A. Rengakos, eds. *Epea Pteroenta: Beiträge zur Homerforschung, Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag*. (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag): 221-29.
- Zaphiropoulou, Ph.N. (2006). "Geometric Battle Scenes on Vases from Paros" in: E. Rystedt, B. Wells, eds. *Pictorial Pursuits: Figurative Painting on Mycenaean and Geometric Pottery, Papers from two seminars at the Swedish Institute at Athens in 1999 and 2001, ActaAth-4<sup>0</sup>* 53. (Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen): 271-77.